DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 893 CE 024 521

TITLE	Career Education Staff Development for Teacher Educators. Final Report, October 1, 1977-September 30, 1978.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	554AH70134
PUB DATE	1 Sep 78
GRANT	G007760066
NOTE	162p.: Parts of the appendixes will not reproduce well due to small, light print. For related documents see ED 132 284 and ED 138 786.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education: Conferences: *Demonstration Programs: *Faculty Development: Followup Studies: *Fused Curriculum: Models: Participant Satisfaction: *Program Effectiveness: Teacher Attitudes: *Teacher Education: Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS	Education Amendments 1974: University of Georgia

ABSTRACT

A College of Education, University of Georgia, project attempted to demonstrate the portability of the Georgia Model containing materials suitable for use in staff development for career education through conferences, provision of materials on the Georgia Model, and followup visits to participants. After studying the model, about 150 faculty members from approximately fifty teacher education institutions were to demonstrate their ability to formulate plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into their preservice teacher education programs. Evaluation consisted of pre-post conference administration of a Career Education Opinionnaire, immediate conference participant feedback, and followup visit evaluation of participant career education activities. Results of the Career Education Opinionnaire indicated and increased understanding of and involvement in career education but only slight variation in perceptions of career education and integration problems. Participant feedback on the conferences was positive. During the followup visits, interivewers found that the majority of conference participants (73%) were significantly involved in implementing career education concepts into their programs. Findings of the third-party evaluation showed high participant ratings for model clarity, helpfulness, and appropriateness. A major negative observation concerned inadequate provision for differences in participant experiences and attitudes. (Project materials are provided in extensive appendixes.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183893

FINAL REPORT TO U.S.O.E.

Career Education Staff Development for Teacher Educators

Grant Number G007760066

College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

September 1, 1978

CE 024 521

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

J. A. Williams
Project Director

Fred D. Holt
Co-Director

1. Project No.

554AH70134

2. Grant No.

G007760066

3. Nature of Report:

___Semi-Annual X Final

4. Project Title:

Career Education Staff Development
For Teacher Educators

5. Period Covered By This Report:

From: October 1, 1977
To: Sept. 30, 1978

6. Category of Project:

___Incremental ___Settings ___Populations X Training ___Communications
___State Plan

7. Project Director:

J.A. Williams

8. Grantee/Assistance Contractor Institution:

University of Georgia
College of Education
Aderhold Building
Athens, Georgia 30602
Phone 404-542-3003

9. Major Activities

Under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, the College of Education, University of Georgia, engaged in a project during 1977-78 to demonstrate the portability of the Georgia Model. The University of Georgia Career Education Staff Development Model for Teacher Educators was developed during 1975-76 through a grant from the U.S.O.E. Office of Career Education. The current project was designed to demonstrate to colleges and universities in several southeastern states the viability of the Georgia Model as a Career Education staff development procedure for college educators.

The demonstration of the Model was based upon 1) three conferences of three days duration, 2) provision of the materials in the Georgia Model, and 3) follow-up visits to participants on their individual campuses. It was anticipated that representatives from the numerous teacher education institutions would be able to demonstrate their ability to formulate plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into their pre-service programs. Stated in behavioral terms the major objective was:

> "As a result of involvement in a study of the University of Georgia Teacher Educator Career Education Staff Development Model, about 150 faculty members from about 50 teacher education institutions will demonstrate their ability to formulate plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into their pre-service teacher education programs."

It was further assumed that, objectively, each college faculty member would:

1. formulate a definition of the term "career education" which reflects consideration of the U.S.O.E. definition and the U.Ga. Model definition.

2. present arguments in favor of the position that career development concepts should be infused in the pre-service preparation of teachers.

3. evidence an understanding of:
   a. the U.S.O.E. position as to the need for career education.
   b. the difference between school-based and community-based career education programs.
   c. the state plan for his/her state for career education.
   d. the University of Georgia model for pre-service training in career education.

4. evidence a knowledge of the changing status of special segments of the population with the concomitant effects upon the life-styles of individuals.

5. show an understanding of the interrelatedness of career education to the future relationships of labor and management.

6. demonstrate through sylabi or practice the ability to infuse career education into content courses.

7. utilize one or more of the University of Georgia Model competencies and strategies in the infusion process of career education into course outlines.

8. report or demonstrate an improved or changed understanding of the concepts underlying career education.

Items 4-8 were revised from the original proposal, after a conference with the project officer and the evaluator associated with the Washington office.

In September, 1977, the project was initiated with a Director, Co-Director, Steering Committee, and an Advisory Panel. Due to personnel changes within the College the present Co-Director replaced two Co-Directors shown in the earlier planning. The replacement Co-Director was a faculty member whereas the previously designated co-directors were not full-time faculty. The Steering Committee included the Project

Co-Director and two members of the team which developed the Georgia Model. The Advisory Committee consisted of representatives of business, labor, industry, and education. Many of these persons had also been involved in the previous project which developed the Georgia Model. A listing of the above individuals is shown in Appendix A.

During September and October plans were formulated and action taken toward the achievement of the major purpose of the project. A brochure was designed and produced to be included in the letters of invitation to colleges and universities of teacher education in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The letter of invitation was prepared and mailed to 178 institutions in the several states as of September 30, 1977. The first mailing was sent to those institutions which had previously indicated their desire to participate in the project, if it was funded. Approximately one week later, a mailing was made to the other institutions.

Each college or university was invited to send a team of three faculty members to one of the three training conferences with the project providing renumeration for the expenses of two of the participants. Criteria for selection included: Faculty selected must be teaching classes which enroll prospective teachers during the Spring of 1978; and the faculty members, in addition to participating in the training at the University of Georgia campus, must be willing to arrange for a project consultant to visit their respective campuses to provide follow-up assistance and to meet with other college faculty members.

Institutions responded to the invitation by designating as few as one and as many as four faculty members to attend one of the Conference.

Initially 149 participants were expected to attend the conference. Unfortunately, the weather and other circumstances prevented the original number of selected participants from attending. During the final conference, February 1978, twelve persons scheduled for attendance did not arrive. However, one hundred twenty-seven faculty members from fifty-four institutions in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee participated in the training conferences. The institutions participating in the program varied in student body size and were both public and private. The participants represented diverse areas of major interest including administration, counseling, educational psychology, social science education, vocational education, and others. The participants were representative of several levels within their institutions, ranging from instructor level through the Dean level. There was a considerable range in the amount of experience possessed by the participants in terms of Career Education.

As shown in the brochure, (Appendix C), the three invitational conferences were scheduled for December 12-14, 1977, January 23-25, 1977, and February 20-22, 1978. The conferences were scheduled for three days, beginning on Mondays which was an effort to accomodate travel requirements for the participants. Each of the conferences was held in the Georgia Center for Continuing Education which is on the campus of the University of Georgia. The Center is a complete unit in that participants could be housed, have access to food service, and attend the meetings within the same structure.

Participants were encouraged to arrive at the Center on Sunday afternoon preceding the opening session on Monday morning. A resource room was established in the Center to provide printed career education materials for review by the participants. Audio-visual material and equipment was also available for the use of participants at the first conference. However, due to the fact that it was not widely used the equipment was not provided for future conferences. Project personnel staffed the resource room on Sunday evening and daily thereafter, so that participants could examine materials if they wished.

Conference programs were scheduled to provide the participants with an opportunity to become familiar with career education and/or extend their present knowledge with emphasis upon the Georgia Model. Each conference opened with a keynote speaker of national prominence. Dr. Edwin Herr of Pennsylvania State University served as the keynoter for two of the conferences. Dr. Bruce Shertzer of Purdue University spoke to the group at the February conference. In addition, a second resource person was used for each conference. This resource person interacted with participants individually and in small groups as well as making a formal presentation. These consultants served to extend the learnings of the participants by emphasizing programs and activities related to career education presently being utilized by other institutions of higher education.

Consultants from both institutions of higher education and public schools were included in the conference program to broaden the participants' perspectives. The leaders of career education from selected public schools emphasized the value of career education learnings for the teachers in the schools. They discussed the need for teachers to be knowledgeable about career education and encouraged the participants to include career education concepts in the programs of study for prospective teachers. Additionally, the UGA Career Education team and Advisory Committee participated actively in the conferences, both on the program and as individuals.

Each conference was designed to give participants an opportunity to 1) define career education, 2) visit a work-site, 3) confer with representatives of business, labor, industry, and education, 4) familiarize themselves with competencies and strategies from the UGA Model, and 5) formulate plans for the infusion of career education concepts in their programs. Packets containing the Georgia Model were given to each participant. These packets which were provided contain a number of publications or reprints. Included in the packet are the following:

A. INSTRUCTOR'S STUDY GUIDE - this booklet provides for self-study or the material for a three-day conference. (Films, slide-tapes, audio cassettes, video tapes recommended for the program are available on a loan basis).

B. CAREER EDUCATION: SELECTED READINGS FOR THE TEACHER EDUCATOR - Selections are by Cramer, Hansen, Herr, Hoyt, and Tennyson.

C. HELPING PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS ATTAIN CAREER EDUCATION TEACHER COMPETENCIES - this is a collection of reports by seven professors including rationale, course outlines, teaching strategies, and evaluation in seven teacher preparation areas: education psychology, elementary education, teaching of the mentally retarded, agricultural education, English, science, and social science education.

D. DISCOVERING AND USING THE STRENGTHS OF THE DISADVANTAGED AND CULTURALLY DIFFERENT IN CAREER EDUCATION by E. Paul Torrance.

E. FUTURE PROBLEM SOLVING AND CAREER EDUCATION by E. Paul Torrance

F. SOCIODRAMA IN CAREER EDUCATION by E. Paul Torrance.

Additionally, there are seven envelopes which contain papers on the following topics:

G. RATIONALE FOR CAREER EDUCATION

H. THE WORLD OF WORK

I. THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM

J. FUTURISM

K. CAREER EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

L. CAREER EDUCATION IN PRE-SERVICE PREPARATION

M. EVALUATION OF PRE-SERVICE TRAINING IN CAREER EDUCATION

Efforts were made at each conference to clarify the purpose of the campus visits and to indicate that the project staff was available for professional activities while on campus. Tentative plans for the visits were made with some participants. In some cases the participants informed the project staff of activities in which they wished the visitor to participate. In March, plans and schedules were formalized for visiting the participants on their home campuses.

In making the arrangements for the on-site visits there were a number of factors to be considered which necessitated efficient planning. The 54 institutions to be visited were widely scattered throughout the Southeast. In addition, there were eight persons who were able to make the visits -- the four project staff members and four of the University of Georgia faculty consultants. The visits had to be made at such a time so as to provide sufficient time for the participants to formulate plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into their programs.

They also had to be made before the end of the school year and at a time when other commitments did not take precedence.

In an attempt to facilitate the scheduling of the visits, the eight project representatives were each assigned a number of institutions which they were to contact and make arrangements for the visit. These assignments ranged from one to sixteen. Because of the initial letters sent to Deans or other upper level administrators of the institutions and since no "leader" as such was designated by the institutions to coordinate activities within the institution, the project representative contacted one of the conference participants and tentative plans were made concerning the visit. The visits were of one to two days duration and included a variety of activities.

The visits were designed to serve three purposes - 1) to reinforce the achievement of the objectives, 2) to encourage a multiplying effect of the training and 3) to provide information and support for a career education emphasis in pre-service education. A significant goal of the on-site visit was to evaluate the achievements of the objectives.

During April and May visits of one to two days duration were made to forty-nine colleges and universities. Five institutions were unable to host the Project representatives because of scheduling conflicts and/or problems within the institution.

Project representatives were engaged in a variety of activities during the on-site visits. In some instances, the representative was informed before the visit of any special activities which were planned. However, very often the visitor arrived on the campus without knowing the extent of institutional plans for the visit. In all cases, project staff members were prepared to meet with the conference participants individually to discuss their plans for the infusion of career education concepts into their programs. On some occasions, arrangements were made for the University of Georgia member to address a group of faculty members or prospective teachers in a formal manner. Informal meetings were held with administrators, such as the College President, Dean, or Department Chairperson, other members of the faculty, and students. A few representatives visited classrooms in the university or college or in public schools to observe the infusion process. One representative attended a meeting of a civic organization in which career education was featured on the program. The visits provided an opportunity to speak to many individuals about career education as exemplified in the Georgia Model for Teacher Educators.

As stated earlier in this section, it was during the visits that extent of the achievement of objectives was to be determined. The activities of the project were designed to demonstrate the use of the Georgia Model and the understanding of career education concepts.

Discussion regarding the achievement of the objectives and supporting data is in the section of this report on "Evaluation."

10. Project Participants

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

NOTE. Participants include those DIRECTLY served by the project or, in the case of most parents and persons in the business/labor/industry community, who actively assist in project implementation. "Actively assist" includes efforts such as serving as resource persons, serving on Advisory Groups, providing work experience, etc.

FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 51-R1107

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (see NOTE above) WHO ARE	RACE/ETHNICITY (all Participants including Handicapped, Gifted and Talented, and Low Income): AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE (1)	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER (2)	BLACK/ NEGRO (3)	CAUCASIAN/ WHITE (4)	HISPANIC (5)	TOTAL (sum of columns (1) through (5)) (6)	OF THE TOTAL (column (6)) NUMBER WHO ARE: HANDI-CAPPED (7)	GIFTED AND TALENTED (8)	LOW INCOME (9)	OF THE TOTAL (column (6)) NUMBER WHO ARE: MALE (10)	FEMALE (11)
STUDENTS											
ELEMENTARY (K-6)											
MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH (7-9)											
SENIOR HIGH (10-12)											
2-YEAR COLLEGE											
4-YEAR COLLEGE (Grad. Student)				4		4				1	3
ADULTS (non-matriculated)											
SUB-TOTAL											
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL							▨	▨	▨		
TEACHERS			21	92		113	▨	▨	▨	71	42
COUNSELORS				6		6	▨	▨	▨	3	3
ADMINISTRATORS			8	23		31	▨	▨	▨	21	10
MEMBERS OF THE BUSINESS/ LABOR/INDUSTRY COMMUNITY			1	8		9	▨	▨	▨	▨	▨
PARENTS							▨	▨	▨	▨	▨
OTHER (specify)							▨	▨	▨	▨	▨
							▨	▨	▨	▨	▨
TOTAL			30	133		163	▨	▨	▨	▨	▨

OE FORM 467, 2/76

11. Evaluation Activities

The project in Career Education at the University of Georgia accomplished its overall goal - "to demonstrate that the University of Georgia Career Education Staff Development Model for Teacher Educators is transportable to other teacher preparation institutions." The accomplishment of the overall goal, major objective and specific objectives are evidenced by the evaluation reports, visits to the participating institutions, and program description included in the final report.

The evaluation plan for the project consisted of three components:

1. Pre-post conference administration of Career Education Opinionnaire.

2. Conference monitoring consisting of observation of all conference activities and utilization of participant feedback forms for daily feedback to project staff.

3. Follow-up visit evaluation of post conference career education activities by participants.

In addition, the project was evaluated by a third-party evaluator. A summary of his report is included in this section. The entire report of the third-party evaluator is in Appendix H.

In reviewing the accomplishments of this project several areas of limitation are noteworthy.

The staff development model in career education and the ensuing proposal for the 1977-78 project were developed in 1975-76. Although some members of that project were available as members of the Advisory Board, Steering Committee, or as Resource persons, the Project Co-Director, and staff assigned to implement the 1977-78 project were demonstrating a Model and carrying out a proposal of which they had little or no previous involvement.

Invitations to participate in the project were sent to Deans, Department Chairpersons, and other such administrators within colleges and universities which had teacher education programs. Individual college or university administrators forwarded the invitation to others or, in some cases, designated specific individuals as participants. As a result, the participants were heterogeneous in areas such as motivation for participating, previous career education experience, major field of interest, and position within the college or university they represented. Thus, the needs of the participants differed significantly. Furthermore, there was not a designated participant charged with responsibility for furthering career education within the institutions nor responsible for on-site visit arrangements. In some cases one of the participants from a particular school or college occupied a leadership position in the institution and, therefore, did perform these tasks.

Another difficulty involved the visits of project personnel to participating institutions. Scheduling visits efficiently and economically as well as at a time convenient to the participants and project staff and which allowed sufficient opportunity to formulate plans was a major task. Consequently, a few participants were unavailable for the on-site interview because of conflicting schedules. Five institutions were not visited because of conflicting schedules. Also, one of the universities was unable to participate because of lack of administrative support.

Unfortunately, the project will not be funded or continued in the immediate future. Several persons indicated during the on-site visitations that assistance would be desirable as they attempted to carry out their plans. Some participants have begun implementing the concepts of infusing career education into their programs since the conference. Others are in the process of developing plans. Whether these plans will be implemented and to what degree is unknown.

In terms of objectives for the project the results of evaluations appear to indicate that the efforts attained success. An examination of the ensuing evaluation reports confirms the overall success of the project. A summary review of the data indicate the following:

The overall objective in behavior terms was: "As a result of involvement in a study of the University of Georgia Teacher Educator Career Education Staff Development Model, about 150 faculty members from about 50 teacher education institutions will demonstrate their ability to formulate plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into their pre-service teacher education programs."

This objective was accomplished as shown by the data secured. The Model has a portability character and can be utilized partially or in full by educational institutions. As indicated elsewhere in this report, the successful use of the Georgia Model is contingent upon the in-serivce staff and the leadership available within the institution.

In addition to the primary goal of the project there were eight secondary objectives. Objectives four through nine were revised after consultation with staff from the Office of Career Education. Each of these objectives were met at varying levels of success. The secondary objectives are shown and discussed below.

"More specifically, each faculty member will":

1. formulate a definition of the term "career education" which reflects consideration of the U.S.O.E. definition and the U.Ga. Model definition.

This particular objective was attained by the project activities. Based upon the data obtained through the several evaluation efforts there was a recognition of various definitions for the term "career education."

2. present arguments in favor of the position that career development concepts should be infused in the pre-service preparation of teachers.

This objective was satisfied as was indicated by the extent of active or proposed infusion of career development concepts as determined by the on-site visits. It is worthy of note, however, that some participants and institutions also were developing or revising specific courses on career education.

Sub-objective three was a multifaceted objective and while the project efforts were directed to meeting the specified goals there was not a concerted effort upon specific components of this sub-objective. It was presumed that the focus and interactions possible would permit and encourage the participants to extend personal learnings.

3. evidence an understanding of:
    a. the U.S.O.E. position as to the need for career education.

Based upon responses to the various follow-up instruments, particularly the third party effort, it appears that this understanding was developed by the participants.

    b. the difference between school-based and community-based career education programs.

The participants appeared to understand the difference between school-based and community-based career education.

c. the state plan for his/her state for career education.

During the conferences it was not possible to fully discuss the diverse and various state plans. However, the participants were encouraged to become knowledgeable about their own state plan.

d. the University of Georgia Model for pre-service training in career education.

As shown by the data collected, and based upon the efforts of the conference, the participants developed an understanding of the Georgia Model for Career Education.

4. evidence knowledge of the changing status of special segments of the population with the concomitant effects upon the life-styles of individuals.

Efforts to attain this objective were of a non-direct nature and, therefore, the degree of attained success was lessened. The focus of this objective was to be upon generalized learnings of the changing status of women, minority groups, and handicapped as the effects of career education are made manifest.

5. show an understanding of the interrelatedness of career education to the future relationships of labor and management.

Unfortunately, the design of the various evaluation instruments did not focus upon this objective. However, there was a modicum of success achieved through the Advisory Committee presentations and discussions. This seems to be supported by the in-house evaluation and is reported in the evaluation section.

6. demonstrate through sylabi or practice the ability to infuse career education into content courses.

This objective was attained as shown by the data obtained through the instruments used and the on-site interviews. In some situations specific staff members or committees had been designated to work on course outlines or infusion into course sylabi.

7. utilize one or more of the University of Georgia Model competencies and strategies in the infusion process of career education into course outlines.

This particular sub-objective is closely related to the preceding one, number six. As shown through the data obtained this objective was met through the activities of the project and the demonstrated understanding of the participants.

8. report or demonstrate an improved or changed understanding of the concepts underlying career education.

Based upon data obtained from several sources it may be safely indicated that this objective was attained. Overall, the majority of the participants indicated a positive change in their understanding of the concepts of career education.

In summary, it appears that while the sub-objectives were met at varying levels the overall analysis is that the project was successful and in large measure satisfied the intention and goal of the project.

11a. Summary of the pre-post questionnaire

The pre-post questionnaire used by the project staff was also used in the 1975-76 project. Unfortunately, an instrument designed to specifically cover the activities of the project was not available, and, further, it appeared appropriate to utilize a tested instrument. (Appendix E). The instruments were mailed to the participants approximately thirty days before and after conference attendance. Names of respondents were not requested; therefore, individual changes could not be determined. The results of the pre-post evaluation were disappointing for a number of reasons. First, the return on the post administration was considerably less than had been anticipated. The return was 98% on the pre-test and 58.4% on the post-test. This may be partially accounted for the time-lag between the Conference and receipt of the post-test by the participants. Also, for some of the participants the post-test was received toward the end of a school term and exams, grades, and end of quarter details intervened. It is worthy of note that no particular role of the participants contributed to the lesser post-test returns than any other primary role.

Another factor to be considered in the post test return might well be the "felt" reflection on the person or the institution due to the nature of the questions. Parallel to this was the failure of many respondents to follow directions on some parts of the instrument. It could be that many did not return their forms simply because of recognition of the manner in which the pre-test was completed. This, of course, is an assumption. A final point is that some participants may have felt that the follow-up visit was sufficient and simply did not feel the post-test was necessary.

Table I

PRE-POST QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Part I Background Information	Number of Respondents 122 Pre	%	73 Post	%
Primary Role:				
Instruction	81	66%	49	67%
Department Chairman	15	12%	9	12%
Administration	11	9%	6	8%
Other	15	12%	8	11%
Levels of the majority of your students:				
Undergraduate	76	62%	45	62%
Graduate	40	33%	22	30%
Not Applicable	0	0	3	4%
Other	6	5%	3	4%
Present degree of understanding C.E.:				
None	1	1%	0	0%
Slight	37	30%	0	0%
Moderate	63	52%	48	66%
Extensive	20	16%	25	34%
Your involvement in C.E.:				
In Serv.	41	34%	27	37%
Dept. Mtg.	20	16%	14	19%
Rdg.	46	38%	33	45%
Service	30	25%	17	23%
Conf.	44	36%	45	62%
Workshop	33	27%	31	42%
Classroom Act.	61	50%	32	44%
No Direct Inv.	23	19%	5	7%
Emphasis on C.E. in your school (next 3-5 years)				
Increased	105	86%	63	86%
Same	5	4%	7	10%
Less	0	0	0	0
Undecided	12	10%	3	4%
Do you have direct involvement?				
Yes	108	89%	66	90%
No	10	8%	7	10%
Other	3	2%	0	0

The results for Part I, Background Information indicates several differences which are meaningful. Responses on the post-test were made by approximately the same percentages of participants in the various roles as replied to the pre-test. In fact, the variation by roles did not exceed one percentage point for any of the four role categories.

The levels of the students taught by the pre-post tests group varied slightly. This variance may be attributed to the decrease in the number of respondents with differing responsibilities between the pre and post tests.

For the respondents on the pre-post questionnaire there are some significant changes in reaction to the question, "What is your present degree of understanding of career education?". There was an increase in understanding from none or slight to moderate or extensive. As shown in Table 1 the greatest percentage of respondents moved to the extensive category.

Involvement in career education also indicated an increase in workshops and conferences with a strong decrease in the "no direct involvement" category. These figures seem to coincide with the "emphasis on career education" category in that the "undecided" group decreased considerably, by six percentage points from ten to only four percent. Direct involvement showed no large changes since obviously faculty members do not change roles rapidly, except in selected situations.

Part II of the questionnaire concerned the view of career education held by respondents. Means of the responses to the eight items in this section varied only slightly from pre to post completion of the instrument.

Table 2

Pre-Post Questionnaire

Part II How Do You View Career Education?	Means Pre	Post
Career Education: (Please feel free to comment on any element rated 1 or 2)		
1. is an integral dimension of education starting in kindergarten.	4.221	4.370
2. extends through adult and continuing education.	4.582	4.548
3. provides opportunities for each individual to develop a realistic perception of his/her own unique capabilities (self-awareness).	4.529	4.417
4. provides a system to acquaint individuals with occupational opportunities (the world of work) available to him/her through exploratory experiences.	4.525	4.315
5. provides a system to prepare individuals for entry and re-entry into employment and/or continuing education.	4.292	4.151
6. enables individuals to develop career decision making/planning skills.	4.541	4.425
7. provides opportunities to explore and appreciate leisure time activities.	3.983	3.945
8. assists individuals in the development of their preferred life style.	4.153	4.139

Variations were so insignificant to indicate there was probably no change in the view of career education held by the participants.

It would appear that the participants had a reasonable view of career education prior to the conferences and little change occurred. Participants may have been chosen to attend the conferences because of their interest or expressed feelings about career education. Another important factor could be the desire to respond with socially acceptable responses. Therefore, change would be difficult to obtain and show.

Part three of the questionnaire is concerned with the applicability of career education as it applies to the respondents' campuses. The scale of responses ranges from strongly disagree as 1 to strongly agree as 5.

Table 3

	Part III Please react to the following statements as they apply to your campus, according to the following code: 1-Strongly Disagree 5-Strongly Agree	Means ($\bar{X}$)	
		Pre	Post
1.	Career Education should be integrated into all levels and facets of education	4.092	4.139
2.	Future teachers and counselors should be provided with experiences which show the relationships between subject content and the world of work	4.392	4.493
3.	The concepts of career education should be integrated into existing teaching method courses	4.233	4.356
4.	We are too subject oriented and fail to provide future teachers and counselors the knowledge and skills needed to humanize education	3.547	3.521
5.	As I look at career education, I see it as a high priority for the program with which I am closely affiliated	4.000	4.082
6.	If given the needed support, I would be interested in becoming involved in career education program development	4.128	3.986
7.	Too much emphasis is being placed on career education when you consider all of the goals of education	4.118	4.137
8.	All future teachers and counselors should possess a working knowledge of career education within their speciality before graduation	4.342	4.397
9.	A course should be made available to teach university student relating his or her major to the life style related to that work role	3.378	3.329
10.	Career education is a fad	4.303	4.260
11.	Career Education has limited implications for future teachers of academic subjects (Math, English, etc.)	4.158	4.208
12.	I am familiar with the U.S. Office of Education Models for Career Education	2.732	3.329
13.	The basic philosophy of career education, as I view it, is sound and worth implementing	4.289	4.384
14.	Each department that offers courses for education majors should offer a course that will provide students with the relationship between its subject area(s) and the world of work	3.686	3.444
15.	Orientation to the world of work is sufficient in our present teacher and counselor education curriculum	4.017	3.793
16.	The number of career education concepts introduced into a course should be at the option of the instructor	3.030	3.384
17.	Each program director should define career education as it relates to his/her own program	3.438	3.671
18.	I am familiar with the career education resource materials available at our university	3.231	3.686
19.	Career education limits student options	1.678	4.334
20.	A university definition of career education should be developed beginning with each department's definition of the concept	3.471	3.486
21.	Discussion and specification of strategies to further develop and integrate career education on our campus should be a high priority	4.030	3.849
22.	In order to better implement career education on our campus, I would like: (1) In-service training sessions offered	3.992	3.930
	(2) More information regarding on-going career education programs in the state	4.262	4.042
	(3) More information regarding on-going career education programs in neighboring states and in the nation	4.244	4.070
	(4) Specific ideas to integrate career education into existing courses	4.408	4.282
	(5) More instructional materials	4.240	4.014
	(6) A clearer campus definition of career education	4.222	3.958
	(7) More published material about career education as it applies to my subject area	4.085	3.926
	(8) More information from local school districts concerning their career education needs	4.305	4.097
	(9) A College or University Career Education Instructional Resource Center	4.017	3.792
	(10) More information relative to the present involvement and future plans of other departments on this campus relative to career education	3.983	3.768
	(11) More advice on local production options, A.V., computer, text-on-demand, etc.	3.890	3.652
	(12) Other	0.0	0.0

Reference to Table 4 will indicate the lack of variation between the means for the pre-post test. Furthermore, with the lesser number of respondents to the post-test the use of mean scores is questionable. Due to the confidentiality of respondents it was not possible to compute the significance of the variance between the specific individuals' responses on the pre-post questionnaires. Item 24 presented a change in format and respondents were asked to rank the top four items as applicable. There were 41.8% of the responses to item 24 which were not usable. This occurred because the ranking was improperly done or not done at all.

Table 4

24. Leadership for career education on this campus should be the responsibility of: (Please rank 1-4, with "1" corresponding to the position of greatest responsibility).

	Percentage of Respondents Rankings							
	Ranks 1		Ranks 2		Ranks 3		Ranks 4	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
An interdisciplinary team	20	24	13	22	18	13	17	11
Department Chairman	4	9	14	11	23	24	17	22
Central/Administration	11	9	4	2	8	4	6	11
School of Education	14	13	8	11	4	9	10	7
Academic Deans	4	9	21	24	14	15	4	4
Program Director	6	0	8	2	7	4	8	9
Program Committee	3	2	7	7	7	4	13	9
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	11	17	4	2	3	4	6	4
A coordinator for Career Ed.	27	15	17	17	10	15	7	11
Other (Please Specify)	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
Other (Please Specify)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0

Based upon the data shown on the preceding page the participants indicated a change in the rank ordering of who should exercise greatest responsibility for Career Education. As noted above, the interdisciplinary term approach seemed to be the most desirable control agent. The Coordinator dropped from first position in the pre-test to third position in the post-test. However, it is also necessary to recognize the decreased response to the post questionnaire.

Part IV

The final section of this questionnaire is concerned with potential problems and integration of career education in the educational process. As shown in Tables 5a and 5b there appears to be little variation in participants responses between the pre and post questionnaire administration.

Table 5a

Potential Problems.

1. I feel potential problems in integrating career education into programs on my campus are the following:

	Pre%	Post%
Faculty apathy towards career education	63%	77%
Lack of time	49	64
Misconceptions about career education	60	74
Lack of administrative support for career education	27	37
Lack of adequate information concerning career education available to faculty	56	47
Resistance to curriculum change	50	55
Resistance to change on the part of the faculty	38	51
Resistance to change by subject oriented departments	57	64
Resistance to change on the part of the administration	14	21
Lack of relevancy of career education	2	5
Lack of commonly accepted university definition	44	32
Other	5	4

Table 5b

2. To more effectively integrate career education into our college or university programs, I feel the following tasks will need to be completed:

	Pre%	Post%
Develop an in-service program and/or workshop for faculty development relative to career education	71%	64%
Identification and dissemination of available on-campus career educational resources	64	64
Identification of needs relative to career education by individual departments	75	68
Development of a commonly accepted definition of career education for this institution	67	58
Identification of on-campus monetary support for career education	51	49
At least one course in career education should be required for teacher-counselor certification	39	36
More effort to sell university administrators on the need for career education	39	40
Faculty acceptance of the philosophy of career education	70	78

Examination of the data in both Tables 5a and 5b indicates little change in the perceptions of the participants. Apparently the participants feel a great need for attention to the problems inherent in the infusion of career education concepts into the curriculum of teacher education institutions. It could be surmised that for career education as a concept to become a valued part of education the administrators of institutions of higher education must become deeply involved.

In summary, the pre-post questionnaire was not a highly valued approach to determining success of the program. This in no way should be construed as a meaningless exercise but rather as a provision of data worthy to be considered in the progression of career education as a viable concept in education.

11b. In-House Evaluation

The training conferences held in December, January, and February formed the basis for the achievement of the project objectives. It was at this time that participants to the conferences were introduced to the University of Georgia Model and the concepts of career education. Thus, it was the goal of the project staff to provide 1) activities which would be meaningful and helpful and 2) an environment conducive to the receptivity of the concepts.

To assist in the achievement of this goal, the evaluation staff attended all conference activities and administered feedback forms to all participants at the end of each day's activities. A Conference Evaluation Scale was administered at the conclusion of each conference. In addition, project staff members and University of Georgia faculty members who served as consultants were contacted for recommendations and comments regarding the conference programming and activities. See Appendix E for instruments used in this phase of evaluation.

The purpose of the evaluation activities was to:

1. assess the effectiveness of the conference activities
2. assess the participants response to conference activities and the appropriateness of the program scheduling
3. provide an opportunity for participants to express their needs and concerns regarding career education and conference activities.

Conferences were held with project staff at the end of each day's activities and at the end of each conference at which time any recommendations for changes in modus operandi or concerns of participants were discussed.

There were differences in the motivation and attitude of the participants which contributed to the mood of the conferences. There was some hostility and frustration expressed by the December group. Based on observation, informal comments, and feedback forms, there are a number of explanations for this attitude. The time of the conference was during Christmas break for many participants. Many expressed their resentment at attending a conference at this time of year. In addition, the first day activities produced a great deal of tension. The introduction to the conference was not sufficient, the schedule was too intense, and certain activities were too loosely structured. There was irrelevant and misdirected questioning by some of the participants during some of the activities. The small group session at the end of the first day provided an opportunity for clarification and discussion of the feelings and concerns of the participants. As a result, the remainder of the conference was more satisfying to the participants.

The January group was the most enthusiastic in their relations with each other in their response to the conference activities and the Georgia Model. There were some participants who had experience with career education concepts and expressed a desire to share their knowledge and experiences during the sessions. This particular conference could have been improved by providing some separate activities to accomodate the differences in experiences in career education among the participants. However, the entire group appeared to be task-oriented and responsive to the activities.

The project staff and consultants found the February group to be the most heterogeneous. Some participants would express satisfaction with an activity while others found the same activity completely unsatisfactory.

As a group, they showed no emotion but appeared to be merely going through the actions.

The feedback forms and mean ratings on the Conference Evaluation reflect the diversity of the groups only slightly. For example, the December group found the small group session on the first day very helpful as it provided an opportunity for them to express their frustrations and clarified some of their questions. The responses of the February group covered a wider range in all areas, although the mean rating was not significantly different from that of the other group.

Based on the evaluation reports of the December conference, the schedule was revised for the remaining conferences. To align the conference activities with the proposal, certain topics or issues were necessary. Therefore, these revisions did not delete activities but only structurally changed. The intensity of the first day's activities was lessened and introductory activities added. Small group sessions in which Sociodrama, Community Resources, etc. were demonstrated were offered twice during the January and February conferences in order to accomodate participants' interests. In addition, arrangements were made to more closely monitor panel discussions in order to guide proper questioning of the panel members. More structure was also achieved by this procedure.

The schedule and procedures for January met with satisfaction by the participants. Thus the schedule was not changed for the February conference. Nevertheless, the program was tightly scheduled, and there were comments throughout the three conferences regarding the need for longer meal times, time to visit the campus, and more time for small group interaction. (Program, Appendix D)

Generally, the conference activities were considered helpful and positive by the participants. The addition of the introductory activities in the January and February conferences assisted in group interaction and paved the way for the rest of the conference by providing background information on the Model.

The keynote remarks by Dr. Edwin Herr were valuable in setting the tone of the conference. Participants responded with enthusiasm to his comments regarding career education. Many participants requested an audio tape of his remarks to be used on their campus. Dr. Bruce Shertzer's comments appealed to approximately two-thirds of the participants.

A summary of the responses for the daily feedback forms follows:

Table 6

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO DAILY FEEDBACK FORMS:

	Yes			No		
	D	J	F	D	J	F
1. Did you have any problems concerning transportation and housing facilities?	6	3	2	29	40	28
2. Did you have an opportunity to read the advanced material?	22	41	23	9	2	9
	Positive			Negative		
3. Do you have any comments about the introductory activities?	-	28	14	-	2	7
4. How did you react to the keynote remarks?	30	47	21	4	1	11
5. Do you have any comments regarding the usefulness of the Symposium?	18	36	15	14	5	10
Small Group Sessions?	17	14	12	0	6	2

6. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the conference schedule?

December	More structure	4
	Introductory activities	4
	More Small Groups	5
	Revise Schedule	7
January	Lunch rushed	4
	More participant involvement	3
	More small groups	3

February Regarding free time 8
More participant involvement 6

	Persons Visiting			Value of Comments					
Worksite Visited	D	J	F*	Positive			Negative		
Reliance Electric	1	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Citizens and Southern Bank	3	6	3	3	4	2	-	-	1
Westinghouse Electric Corp.	7	10	2	5	6	1	-	1	-
Georgia Power Company	3	7	7	4	6	3	-	-	2
Dupont Company	12	7	4	11	5	2	-	2	-
Southern Bell	0	4	0	1	1	-	-	2	-
Small Group Sessions Attended									
Use of Sociodrama	16	24	12	14	20	8	-	-	-
Community Resources in C.E.	-	8	3	-	4	3	-	3	-
Future Problem Solving	7	17	11	6	16	7	-	1	1
Bread and Butterflies	5	17	7	5	13	4	-	4	-

*D = December Conference
J = January Conference
F = February Conference

The activities were not generally rated negatively, however, there were negative remarks about the procedure or a presentor. Some participants desired more small group sessions in which they could interact with each other and conference consultants.

At the end of each conference, participants were requested to complete a Conference Evaluation Scale. On a seven point scale, no activities were rated below a mean level of 4.00. The results are shown in Table 7

Table 7

Mean scores obtained on a seven point Conference Evaluation Scale.

	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.
Speech	5.58	6.15	4.21
Panel: Representatives of Business, Industry, and Education	4.14	4.77	5.43
Small Group Sessions (Monday)	5.06	4.12	4.96
Worksite Visits	5.47	5.24	5.85
Dinner Speaker	5.47	5.06	4.68
Symposium: Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Career Education at the University of Georgia	4.62	5.18	4.75
World of Work and Career Education	5.42	4.87	5.45
Small Group Sessions (Sociodrama, etc.)	6.03	6.58	5.68
Strategies and Curriculum Materials	5.50	5.16	5.52
Informal Interaction with Conference Participants	5.80	6.85	5.59

At this time, also, participants were asked if their concept of career education changed as a result of their attending the conference. The majority of respondents answered that it had changed. Some participants who answered "no" added a qualifying statement indicating that it reinforced or clarified what had already been known. The question and tabulated results as as follows:

Did your concept of career education change as a result of your attending this conference?

	Yes	No	Qualifying Remarks
December	23	13	4
January	21	11	5
February	9	12	6

In summary, the project staff accomplished their goals regarding the conferences. Activities were considered meaningful and helpful in introducing the concepts of career education and the University of Georgia Model. The environment was conducive to the receptivity of concepts. The Georgia Center, in which the conferences were held, was considered a most pleasant setting for a conference. In addition, throughout the conferences there were a number of expressions of praise for the project staff and conference implementation. In December there were three written comments of "excellent"; in January there were 20; and in February, six. In addition, there were verbal expressions and letters received after the conferences indicating the high level of satisfaction.

llc. Report of On-site Visitation

One of the purposes of the visits to the campuses of the conference participants was to evaluate the participants' activities within their institutions as they pertained to the objectives. To facilitate the determination of the achievement of the objectives, an interview form was prepared by the evaluators. (Appendix E) This form was to be used by the University of Georgia staff when making the on-site visits. A session was held to orient the project members in the use of the form. Project representatives were instructed to see the conference participants individually and to ask the questions on the first page directly. These questions dealt with concepts of career education and the Georgia Model. The second page of the form contained questions relating to the visitor's perceptions.

Participants were visited in 49 institutions. Five institutions were unable to host project representatives. In addition, some participants within an institution were not available for the interview because of conflicting engagements.

The visits were made by eight individuals representing the Project. Their manner of reporting the answers to the questions were naturally different. Some paraphrased the response after leaving the meeting. Others wrote the response during the interview. Some had the participants write their own answers. Therefore, the responses to the questions contain subjective variations. The responses were categorized and tabulated by one person in an attempt to limit any further distortions or variations. Interviewer remarks as recorded were analyzed by the in-house evaluator and key words and phrases were determined and tabulated. In an effort to condense the key words or phrases, the "flavor" of the responses was often diluted. Furthermore, the interviewers' styles of recording responses varied considerably in that essential elements were sometimes difficult to ascertain. As one could surmise the interviewer responses reflected the perceptions of the project staff member as well as the perceptions of the respondent.

Part I was designed to assess awareness of career education concepts as exemplified in the University of Georgia Model. In answering the question: "How would you define career education?" there were four inappropriate responses. These responses were of a vocational education nature. Other responses and the number of times a similar comment was given are summarized as follows:

related education and the world - 24
assists decision making process - 20
increases knowledge of self - 27
preparation for life (lifestyles, life activities) - 26
awareness of occupations and/or careers - 22
leads to personal growth and development - 9

In addition, there were 11 references to the definition as given in the University of Georgia Model and 17 comments regarding the infusion process. A review of the responses indicates that the participants are, in fact, able to define career education in a manner which reflects consideration of the U.S.O.E. definition and the U.Ga. Model definition.

The role of career education in public schools was viewed in the following way:

infusing career education concepts - 18
help students be aware of opportunities - 23
help students understand characteristics of oneself - 23
relate school to life - 25
develop decision making skills - 14
prepare students for life - 11
prepare students for work - 4

Based on the above responses, it was determined that participants have an understanding of school-based career education programs.

The third question in Part I dealt with the understanding of the Georgia Career Education Model. Interviewers were asked to list any specific competencies mentioned. The four competencies as given in the Model and references to each are as follows:

Competency I -	ASSIST STUDENTS TO DISCOVER THEIR CHARACTERISTICS (WHAT AM I LIKE?), TO UNDERSTAND REASONS FOR THESE CHARACTERISTICS (WHY AM I THAT WAY?), TO SEE WAYS IN WHICH THESE CHARACTERISTICS CAN BE CHANGED (HOW CAN I CHANGE?), AND TO SEE WAYS IN WHICH THESE CHARACTERISTICS ARE CAREER RELATED.	37
Competency II -	ASSIST STUDENTS TO UTILIZE PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS IN MAKING CAREER DECISIONS.	34
Competency III -	ASSIST STUDENTS TO SEE AND DEVELOP CLEAR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN WHAT THEY ARE BEING ASKED TO LEARN IN SCHOOL AND POTENTIAL FUTURE CAREERS.	37
Competency IV -	ASSIST STUDENTS TO DEVELOP CAREER-RELATED PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS.	23

In thirteen of the interviews, it was reported that the participants had a clear understanding of the four competencies as given in the Model. One staff member reported that seven of the participants visited did not see the Georgia Model as a model but rather as a collection of materials. Twenty-nine respondents felt that the Model demonstrated the infusion process. Generally, the results indicate an understanding of the competencies and the intent of the UGA Model.

Part II of the questionnaire concerned the implementation of the Model since attending the conference. In response to the question "Have you attempted to use career education materials for concepts in your teaching?", approximately 85% of the respondents answered in the affirmative. The participants were using all or parts of the model in various ways. The following uses were indicated:

Infusing concepts (UGA Model) into courses	39
Using Model for developing future plans	27
Students using Model as guide for projects	12
Specific uses of Model	21
(Future problem solving - 6; Site visits - 3; Sociodrama - 3; Community involvement - 3; other - 6)	

The final question on page one to which the participants responded was in regard to dissemination of career education concepts. Two of the respondents indicated that they had not talked to others either formally or informally about career education. There were 98 indications that career education had been discussed. There were 30 formal discussions or presentations and 68 discussions of an informal nature. In addition, five participants indicated specific ways they had made available the Model for the use of other faculty members within their institution.

Part III, the second page of the on-site evaluation guide, was the Interviewer's section. The first question concerned activities of the interviewer while visiting the participants at their home campuses. The remainder of the questions required the interviewer to evaluate the visit, degree of involvement and interest, and evidence of change in activities and attitude as a result of participating in the conference. These responses were based on the perceptions of the interviewer while at the institution.

It was determined that the visits accomplished a worthwhile objective. In response to this specific question, there were 72 positive comments and six answered with a moderate statement. Seven of the visits elicited a negative response. The visits provided the opportunity for project representatives to assist participants in planning programs to infuse career education concepts. In many cases, the visits were used to clarify and/or reinforce concepts gained while at the conference. The additional contact with conference participants gave support and credence to the conference activities. This support was valuable to the participants and individuals and also assisted in their relations with administrators and other faculty members.

Another important benefit of the visits was the opportunity they provided for project representatives to talk with others concerning career education and the University of Georgia Model. The project staff while on-site indicated the following number of activities.

Met with conference participants	92
Met with department head or Dean of College	32
Met with President or Graduate Dean, etc.	5
Met with faculty members	30
Met with others outside institutuion	8
Presented formal talk to faculty groups	10
Presented formal talk to students	2

As indicated, the project representatives met with participants, administrators, faculty, and students. These meetings were often informal, but in some instances, formal presentations concerning career education were given. The project representatives also met with individuals or groups outside the participating institution. These meetings were with community groups or public school personnel. There are no accurate data on the number of persons attending the several groups reported above. Thus, in addition to introducing the concepts of career education as exemplified in the UGA Model to conference participants, a large number of other persons were also make aware of the project.

The interviewers found the majority of the conference participants actively involved in either formulating or implementing plans for career education. In response to the question "What is your overall impression of the individual's involvement and interest in career education?", almost 73% responded that there was a high level of involvement, great enthusiasm, or a considerable degree of interest in pursuing plans in the future. The above comments generally preceded more specific statements regarding the activities and plans of the individual.

Seventeen of the responses were of a moderate nature. These were comments such as "fairly committed" or "growing interest." Specific statements indicated that such individuals would take action if it were convenient for them as regards to time or if they received additional reinforcement.

There were three responses that indicated that nothing of significance was occurring. Those individual participants displayed little or no interest.

The final question asked "Was there any evidence of change as a result of participating in the project?" There were 56 affirmative, 6 moderate, and 16 negative responses. Regarding the negative responses there were eight qualifying statements indicating that changes would occur next year when plans which were developed over the summer sould be implemented. In addition, there were twenty-five comments regarding the individual's previous involvement with career education. As stated earlier in this report, some participants were previously working in the area of career education such as directors of programs or teaching career education courses.

In summary, it can be determined that the majority of the conference participants are significantly involved in implementing career education concepts into their programs as a result of attending the conference.

They have discussed the concepts with others. They also indicated an understanding of career education and the UGA Model. It would appear that the visits were indeed worthy of the time, effort, and expenses in that they served to further the cause of career education.

11d. Third Party Evaluation

The project was also evaluated by an outside evaluator who was given full support by the project staff. A brief description of his findings are shown below; the complete text of the report is shown in Appendix H.

Prepared by Marion Asche, Third Party Evaluator.

Summary, Interpretation and Conclusions

Evaluation findings speak well for the management, processes and content of the conferences and project in general. The lack of direct measures of project impact prevent making conclusions beyond that indicated by staff and participant reports. Participants were overall quite complimentary in their assessment of the conferences both during their attendence and after conference "hawthorne" effect should have diminished.

Participant ratings of the clarity, helpfulness and appropriateness of the model were high with few negative ratings. One of the primary goals of the original funded project was to simplify the vast literature of career education and career development to a concise, understandable "model." Participant reaction indicates that this original goal was achieved.

The findings indicate a mixed reaction to the specific project subobjectives with lowest rating awarded to objective 3a (Figure 2e), objective 3b (Figure 2d) and Objective 4 (Figure 2b). The evaluator's observations at the second conference indicated that objectives 3a -c, 4 and 5 did not receive a specific focus in the conference above that provided in the project materials and that which could be inferred from the two major panel discussions.

The major negative observation is that inadequate provisions were made for the very wide range of experience and attitude of the participants.

The selection procedures could not control this variance in experience level of participants so more effort on the part of the project staff in this area probably would have been fruitful.

Overall, there is ample evidence to conclude that the UGA Career Education for Teacher Educators project did, to a high degree, successfully carry out its proposed activities and was successful in accomplishing major purposes. The extent of long range impact of the project on the participating institutions is unknown but at least a minimum level of technical assistance and follow-through with the most promising institutions would seem to be a good investment.

12. Anticipated changes and/or problems. Not applicable.

13. Dissemination Activities:

While the purpose of the project was to demonstrate portability of the Georgia Model there were a number of dissemination activities conducted.

Project staff developed several items to be included in the materials packet for participants. An Overview of Purposes and Materials, A Selected Bibliography, and A Guide for Infusing Career Education Into Public School Subject Area Courses were prepared to assist conference participants (Appendix F).

An audio-visual presentation was recorded which is available for loan to persons and/or institutions upon request. It consists of a panel discussion regarding the rationale for the infusion of career education concepts in teacher education programs and the use of the University of Georgia Staff Development Model. The panel members are E. Paul Torrance, Educational Psychology; Charles Berryman, Social Science Education; and Ramon Veal, Language Arts Education, with Patricia L. Dwinell serving as moderator. The panel members were involved in the development of the Model and served as consultants for the 1977-78 project.

While visiting the participating institutions to meet with conference participants, project staff members were called upon to speak with others concerning career education and the project. Presentations and/or discussions were conducted with groups in both formal and informal situations. Faculty and students were involved in these activities. In addition, conference participants have spoken to others informally and formally and have made available the Model for the use of others within their organizations or institutions.

The Co-Director attended the Career Education Project Directors meetings in Washington, D.C. and Atlanta, Georgia. The project was discussed informally with other Project Directors at the Atlanta meeting.

Project Staff members attended the annual conference of the Georgia Association of School Counselors and presented a program on the University of Georgia Model for Teacher Educators. A second program on Career Decision-Making was also given.

Three of the project staff members presented a program on the Georgia Model and Career Education at the Middle School Education Conference, Milledgeville, Georgia. This was an invitational conference of teachers and administrators of middle schools in the State of Georgia.

Complete packets or specific selections of the University of Georgia Model have been sent to persons and/or institutions upon request.

14. Special Activities

Project Staff visited two school-based career education projects in Georgia - Crisp County and Rome City Schools. The purpose of the visits was to observe methods of infusing career education concepts into the academic classroom and to confer with personnel.

15. Report Abstract

The Career Education Staff Development for Teacher Educators project of the College of Education, University of Georgia attempted, during 1977-78, to demonstrate the portability of the Georgia Model. This Model contains materials suitable for use in staff development for career education. A basic premise undergirding the Georgia Model is the process of infusion rather than the addition of another subject or another specialized teacher. The infusion of career education concepts into the instructional program when the concepts are appropriate is seen as an advantageous approach.

This project was implemented with a Director, Co-Director, Steering Committee, and an Advisory Board representative of business, industry, labor, and education. .

The Career Education Staff Development for Teacher Educators project had as the major purpose to demonstrate the portability of the Georgia Model. The major objective was:

> As a result of involvement in a study of the University of Georgia Teacher Educator Career Education Staff Development Model, about 150 faculty members from about 50 teacher education institutions will demonstrate their ability to formulate plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into their pre-service teacher education programs.

Subsumed under this major objective were eight secondary objectives which read as follows. More specifically each college faculty member will:

1. Formulate a definition of the term "career education" which reflects consideration of the U.S.O.E. definition and the U.Ga. Model definition.
2. Present arguments in favor of the position that career development concepts should be infused in the pre-service preparation of teachers.
3. Evidence an understanding of:
    a. the U.S.O.E. position as to the need for career education.

   b. the difference between school-based and community-based career education programs.

   c. the state plan for his/her state for career education.

   d. the University of Georgia model for pre-service training in career education.

4. evidence a knowledge of the changing status of special segments of the population with the concomitant effects upon the life-styles of the individuals.

5. show an understanding of the interrelatedness of career education to the future relationships of labor and management.

6. demonstrate through sylabi or practice the ability to infuse career education into content courses.

7. utilize one or more of the University of Georgia Model competencies and strategies in the infusion process of career education into course outlines.

8. report or demonstrate an improved or changed understanding of the concepts underlying career education.

The project accomplished its major purpose but with varying levels of success on the secondary objectives. Extended time to continue to work with participants into another year would provide for maximal impact and greater change and success.

In terms of the primary objective, the data available to the staff and as received from the third party evaluator indicates that the project was successful. Obviously, the Georgia Model is transportable but it's effectiveness is maximized when the needs of the institution are recognized and the leadership and proponents are motivated to implement the Model.

Evaluation results tend to indicate that several secondary objectives were attained at a lower level than other secondary objectives. This may be attributed to lesser specific emphasis on these items at the conferences. Overall, however, the secondary objectives appear to have been attained satisfactorily. Use of the materials, with attention to the efforts expended at the Conferences, should see the participants demonstrating the effectiveness of the Model to further career education.

APPENDICES

A. PROJECT PERSONNEL

B. LETTER OF INVITATION

C. BROCHURE

D. CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

E. EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

F. MATERIALS

G. NEWSLETTERS

H. THIRD PARTY EVALUATION REPORT

I. PICTURES

APPENDIX A

Project Personnel

APPENDIX A

Project Director - J. A. Williams, Dean of College of Education
Project Co-Director - F. D. Holt, Director, Student Personnel Services

Steering Committee - E. Paul Torrance, Chairman - Educational Psychology
Ray Bruce, Curriculum and Supervision
Fred D. Holt, Student Personnel Services

Evaluation Specialists - Paul Wood, Educational Psychology - Research
Marion Asche, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Patricia Dwinell, Graduate Assistant

Advisory Board - Dr. Walter Allen, Vice-Principal, Cedar Shoals High School, Athens, Georgia

Mr. Peter Argo, Local 3203, Communication Workers of America and Athens Central Labor Board

Mr. E. Dunbar Harrison, Jr., Executive Vice President, Citizens and Southern Bank, Athens

Mrs. Evelyn Neely, Director, Athens Child Development, Inc., Athens

Mr. Jack Semler, Personnel Director, Reliance Electric Co., Athens

Mr. Allen D. Stephenson, Executive Director, Athens Area Chamber of Commerce, Athens

Dr. Paul Vail, Coordinator, Guidance and Counseling, State Department of Education, Atlanta

Project Assistants - Mrs. Patricia Duttweiler, Adult Education
Mrs. Patricia Dwinell, Educational Psychology
Mr. James Hurt, Educational Media

University Faculty Team - Dr. Ray Bruce, Curriculum and Supervision
Dr. Paul Torrance, Educational Psychology
Dr. Paul Wood, Educational Psychology
Dr. Horace Hawn, Elementary Education
Dr. Ramon Veal, Language Arts
Dr. Kenneth Ricker, Science Education
Dr. Charles Berryman, Social Science Education
Dr. Ira Dickerson, Vocational Education
Dr. Robert Ball, Counselor Education

APPENDIX B

1. Letter of Invitation
2. Follow-up Letter to Participants (sample)
3. Assignment of On-Site Visitor

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
ATHENS, GEORGIA 30601

September 30, 1977

It is my pleasure to write you that the Career Education Project has been funded. You will recall that you replied to Dr. Alex Perrodin's letter about the project and indicated that you wished to participate. Please consider this letter as your invitation to attend one of the three scheduled conferences. The conference will focus upon the utilization of the University of Georgia Model for Pre-Service Training of Teachers in Career Education. This model was developed in a U.S.O.E. funded project during 1975-76.

There will be three Career Education Workshops conducted during the 1977-78 year. The emphasis will be upon the infusion of career education concepts into pre-service education programs. You are invited to participate in any one of the three which are scheduled for December 11-14, 1977, January 22-25, 1978, and February 19-22, 1978. Unfortunately, the number of participants for each workshop is limited by the space, personnel, and financial support available.

Criteria which will be used in the final selection of participating institutions are as follows:

1. Three selected faculty members will attend the conference. The host institution, the University of Georgia, will provide remuneration for the expenses of two of the three participants.
2. Those faculty members attending the workshop must be scheduled to teach prospective teachers during the Spring of 1978.
3. The selected faculty members must be willing to arrange for a project staff member to visit their respective campuses. This visit will provide for follow-up assistance and an opportunity for the project staff member to meet with other faculty members.

It is our intent to provide an opportunity for your faculty members to benefit personally and, in turn, to directly and indirectly enhance the education of prospective teachers. The latter, of course, could occur through the classes of the workshop participants as well as through their interaction with other faculty members in their institutions.

We would like to notify those institutions which wish to participate of their selection no later than November 10, 1977. We are enclosing a number of brochures for your use. Therefore, will you please inform us of your selected faculty and either include or ask them to return the reply portion of the brochure at the earliest possible date. We look forward to the participation of your institution in this project.

Please feel free to write or call (404-542-3003) if you wish further information.

Sincerely,

Fred D Holt

Fred D. Holt
Co-Director
Career Education Project

FDH:sem

Attachment

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
ATHENS, GEORGIA 30602

We are pleased that you will be attending the Conference on Career Education for Teacher Educators February 20-22, 1978. To assist you in planning for your attendance at the February Conference we are providing the following information:

1. Reservations have been made for you in the Georgia Center for Continuing Education. You may check in anytime after 1:00 P.M. on Sunday, Feb. 19, 1978.
2. Please return the enclosed Georgia Center Pre-Registration Form by February 10, 1978.
3. Conference registration will be at 8:00-8:45 A.M. on Monday, second floor registration desk. The opening session will begin at 9:00 A.M.
4. The Conference will terminate about 2:00 P.M. on Wednesday Feb. 22, 1978. Please do not schedule early departure since this final session is very important.

We are looking forward to a meaningful Conference and your attendance and participation is expected to enhance it. If you wish further information please feel free to call or write me (404-542-3003).

Sincerely,

Co-Director
Career Education

FDH:lys

enclosure

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
ATHENS, GEORGIA 30602

March 1, 1978

TO: Career Education Conference Participants

FROM: Fred D. Holt

RE: Campus Visits by Conference Personnel

Based upon your responses to our inquiry, plans have been completed for our visits to your campuses. I am sure you recognize the problems associated with planning but we think our schedule will work. With your kind assistance I feel that the final phase of our project will be completed in a meaningful manner.

This visit will be designed to serve several purposes. First, the visit will serve as a follow-up to the Conference activities related to the infusion of Career Education concepts into courses. Secondly, we will be pleased to assist you with career education related problems or concerns. And, finally, if you have special professional requests or activities in which you desire our assistance you should feel free to ask. We would appreciate it very much if you would let us know in advance if you desire our involvement with groups, either faculty or students.

The person who will be visiting your campus is ____________________. The visiting staff member will be calling you soon to establish a date and time. Also, you will receive a letter from the staff member confirming the visit.

FDH:lys

APPENDIX C

Brochures

CONFERENCES
ON
CAREER EDUCATION
FOR
TEACHER EDUCATORS

College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens
30602

404-542-3003

Career Education
Staff Development Project

In 1975-76 the University of Georgia through a grant from the U.S. Office of Education developed the Georgia Career Education Staff Development Model for Teacher Educators. For the year 1977-78 the U.S.O.E. funded this project to demonstrate the transportability of the model.

The basis of the project is the conduct of three invitational conferences for teacher educators and the concomitant follow-up activities. The conferences will include presentations, small group activities, site visitations, and symposia or panels. Participants will have an opportunity to examine career education materials of relevance. Each participant will receive the G.C.E.S.D. materials packet upon registration.

In order to extend the potential of the conferences each participating institution will be invited to send three faculty members to one of the conferences. The Project will provide remuneration of the expenses of two of the three participants. The criteria for selection of participating institutions will include:

1. Faculty selected must be scheduled to teach classes which enroll prospective teachers during the Spring term.

2. The faculty members attending must also be willing to arrange for project consultants to visit their respective campuses to provide follow-up assistance and meet with other faculty members. Follow-up visits will be planned for March, April, and May.

In addition, each participant will be asked to complete a pre-assessment instrument prior to the conference.

The three conferences have been scheduled for December 11-14, 1977, January 22-25, 1978, and February 19-22, 1978. We will endeavor to schedule each group of participants on the basis of their first choice as shown on the reply form. However, it may be necessary to move to the second or third choice of conference dates.)

We will notify participating institutions of their selection no later than November 10, 1977.

If you need further information please write or, if you wish, call us at 404-542-3003.

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

Dr. J.A. Williams, Director
Dr. Fred D. Holt, Co-Director

I will be attending the ______ CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS CONFERENCE

NAME and TITLE: ______

ADDRESS: ______

TEACHING AREAS: ______

COURSES TAUGHT ______

YEARS TEACHING: College ______ High School ______

CONFERENCE DATES PREFERRED (Please Rank Order) ( ) Dec. ( ) Jan. ( ) Feb.

APPENDIX D

Conference Programs

PROGRAM

All General Sessions in Room L
Room O will serve as Resource Room

MONDAY, DECEMBER 12

8:15– 9:00 a.m.	Registration, Second Floor Registration Desk
9:00– 9:30	Welcome and Overview—Dean J. A. Williams and Dr. Paul Torrance
9:30–10:30	"A Rationale and Purpose for Career Education" —Dr. Edwin L. Herr, Professor and Head, Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University
10:30–11:00	Refreshment Break, Lobby Lounge
11:00– Noon	Panel: Representatives of Business, Industry, and Education —Dr. Walter Allen, Cedar Shoals High School —Mr. Peter Argo, Local 3203, Communication Workers of America and Athens Central Labor Board —Mr. Dunbar Harrison, Jr., Citizens and Southern Bank —Mrs. Evelyn C. Neely, Athens Child Development, Inc. —Mr. Jack Semler, Reliance Electric Company —Mr. Allen D. Stephenson, Chamber of Commerce —Dr. Paul Vail, State Department of Education
Noon– 1:30 p.m.	Lunch (on your own)
1:30– 3:00	Symposium: Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Career Education at the University of Georgia —Dr. Paul Torrance, Educational Psychology —Dr. Charles Berryman, Social Science Education —Dr. Ira Dickerson, Agricultural Education —Dr. Horace C. Hawn, Elementary Education —Dr. Kenneth Ricker, Science Education —Dr. L. Ramon Veal, Language Education
3:00– 3:30	Refreshment Break, Lobby Lounge
3:30– 4:30	Small Group Sessions, Rooms L, G, E, and R —Ms. Pat Dwinell, Ms. Pat Duttweiler, Mr. Jim Hurt, and Dr. Fred Holt will serve as group leaders Please focus upon the following questions for discussion purposes and Wednesday's activities: 1. How have the days's activities affected your concept of career education? 2. Has the University of Georgia Team provided you with ideas for the implementation and fusion of career education into Teacher Education? 3. Have the activities tended to bring into focus needs, questions, and conconcerns relevant to your professional activities? What are these?
5:00	Dinner (on your own)
8:00–10:00	Group Interaction Session (Meet in Lobby at 7:45 p.m.)

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13

8:00– 9:30 a.m.	Breakfast and Preparation for Worksite Visit, Banquet Area
9:30–11:30	Visits to Worksites: Reliance Electric Company; Citizens and Southern Bank; Westinghouse Electric Corporation; Georgia Power Company; DuPont Company Assistance in arrangements provided by Mr. Allen Stephenson, Chamber of Commerce.
11:30– 1:00 p.m.	Lunch (on your own)
1:00– 2:30	The World of Work and Career Education —Ms. Sharon Colson, Texas A & M University, Moderator —Ms. Helen Smith, Rome City Schools —Dr. Jerry Purser, Clarke County Schools —Ms. Betty Homyak, Crisp County Schools
2:30– 3:00	Refreshment Break, Lobby Lounge
3:00– 3:30	Introductions to Small Group Sessions —Dr. E. Paul Torrance —Dr. Ronald Harper —Mrs. E. Paul Torrance —Dr. Paul Vail
3:30– 5:00	Small Group Sessions, Rooms L, G, E. and R —Dr. E. Paul Torrance, Use of Sociodrama —Dr. Ronald Harper, Community Resources in Career Education —Mrs. E. Paul Torrance, Future Problem Solving Program —Dr. Paul Vail, Bread and Butterflies
6:30	Dinner, Banquet Area Speaker: Ms. Sharon Colson, Assistant Director, Career Education for Gifted and Talented, Texas A & M University

(continued on back)

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14

8:00– 8:30 a.m.	Group Meeting: Discussion on Expenses and Consultant Visits
8:30–10:00	Small Group Sessions on Strategies and Curriculum Materials. Group A: Dr. Charles Berryman, Social Studies . . . . Room L Group B: Dr. Horace C. Hawn, Elementary Education. . . . . Room G Group C: Dr. Kenneth Ricker, Science Education. . . . . Room E Group D: Dr. E. Paul Torrance, Educational Psychology . . . . Room R Group E: Dr. Ira Dickerson, Vocational Agriculture . . . . .Room M Group F: Dr. Ramon Veal, Language Education. . . . . Room C
10:00–10:30	Refreshment Break, Lobby Lounge
10:30– Noon	Continuation of preceding sessions with emphasis on individual concerns related to infusion of career education in course outlines.
Noon– 2:00 p.m.	Luncheon, Evaluation, and Follow-Up Visit Planning, Banquet Area

SPONSORED BY

The University of Georgia
College of Education
and
a grant from the Office of Career Education of the U. S. Office of Education

CONFERENCE ADMINISTRATION:

Director, Dr. J. A. Williams, Dean College of Education, University of Georgia

Co-Director, Dr. Fred D. Holt, Director, Student Personnel Services, College of Education, University of Georgia

Paul R. Kea, Coordinator, College of Education Programs in Continuing Education
will represent the Georgia Center for this conference activity.

The University of Georgia continues its policy of non-discrimination on the basis of sex in compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 in all activities and programs under its sponsorship. In addition, the University of Georgia is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Career Education
for Teacher Educators

December 12-14, 1977

The University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education / Athens

PROGRAM

. . . General Sessions in Lower Level Auditorium . . .

MONDAY, JANUARY 23

8:15– 9:00 a.m.	Registration	Second Floor Registration Desk
9:00– 9:15	Welcome—Dr. J. A. Williams, Dean of the College of Education	
9:15–10:00	Introduction to the Conference	
10:00–10:30	Refreshment Break	Lobby Lounge
10:30– Noon	"A Rationale and Purpose for Career Education" —Dr. Edwin L. Herr, Professor and Head, Division of Counseling and Education Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University	
Noon– 1:00 p.m.	Lunch	(on your own)
1:00– 3:00	Symposium: Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Career Education at the University of Georgia —Dr. Paul Torrance, Educational Psychology —Dr. Ray Bruce, Curriculum and Supervision —Dr. Charles Berryman, Social Science Education —Dr. L. Ramon Veal, Language Education —Dr. Horace Hawn, Elementary Education —Dr. Kenneth Ricker, Science Education —Dr. Ira Dickerson, Agricultural Education	
3:00– 3:30	Refreshment Break	Lobby Lounge
3:30– 6:00	Small Groups —Ms. Pat Dwinell, Ms. Pat Duttweiler, Mr. Jim Hart, and Dr. Fred Holt will serve as group leaders. Please focus upon the following questions for discussion purposes and in preparation for Wednesday's activities. 1. How have the day's activities effected your concept of career education? 2. Has the University of Georgia Team provided you with ideas for the implementation and fusion of career education into Teacher Education? 3. Have the activities tended to bring into focus needs, questions, and concerns relevant to your professional activities? What are these?	Rooms A, B, C, and D
6:00	Dinner	

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24

8:00– 9:15 a.m.	Breakfast (Preparation for Visits)	Banquet Area
9:30– Noon	Worksite Visits	
Noon– 1:15 p.m.	Lunch	(on your own)
1:15– 1:45	Introductions to Small Groups	
1:45– 3:00	Small Group Sessions —Dr. E. Paul Torrance, Sociodrama —Dr. Paul Vail, Bread and Butterflies Approach —Ms. Pansy Torrance, Future Problem Solving Program —Dr. Ronald Harper, Community Resources in Career Education	Rooms A, B, C, and D
3:00– 3:30	Refreshment Break	Lobby Lounge
3:30– 5:00	Repeat of above sessions	
7:00	Dinner Speaker: Ms. Sharon Colson, Assistant Director, Career Education for Gifted and Talented, Texas A & M University	Banquet Area

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25

8:00– 8:30 a.m.	General Session: Discussion on Expenses and Consultant Visits	
8:30–10:00	Small Group Sessions on Strategies and Curriculum Materials	Rooms M, N, O, and R

(continued on back)

10:00–10:30	Refreshment Break	Lobby Lounge
10:30– Noon	Career Education and Public Schools —Dr. Charles M. Hill, Superintendent of Schools, Crawford County —Ms. Dianne Moore, Middle School Counselor, Crawford County —Dr. Jerry Purser, Director, Vocational-Technical Education, Clarke County Schools	
Noon– 12:45 p.m.	Advisory Committee Comments —Mr. Dunbar Harrison, Jr. —Mr. Jack Semler —Dr. Walter Allen —Dr. Paul Vail —Mr. Allen Stephenson —Mrs. Evelyn Neely —Mr. [illegible] Argo	
12:45– 2:00	Luncheon, Evaluation and Follow-Up Visit Planning	Banquet Area

SPONSORED BY

The University of Georgia
College of Education
and
a grant from the Office of Career Education of the U. S. Office of Education

CONFERENCE ADMINISTRATION:

Director, Dr. J. A. Williams, Dean College of Education, University of Georgia

Co-Director, Dr. Fred H. Holt, Director, Student Personnel Services, College of Education, University of Georgia

Paul R. Kea, Coordinator, College of Education Programs in Continuing Education
will represent the Georgia Center for this conference activity.

The University of Georgia continues its policy of nondiscrimination on the basis of sex in compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 in all activities and programs under its sponsorship. In addition, the University of Georgia is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Career Education for Teacher Educators

January 23-25, 1978

The University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education / Athens

PROGRAM

. . . General Sessions in Room K . . .
. . . Room R will serve as Resource Room . . .

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20

8:15– 9:00 a.m.	Registration . . . . Second Floor Registration Desk
9:00– 9:15	Welcome—Dr. J. A. Williams, Dean of the College of Education
9:15–10:00	Introduction to the Conference
10:00–10:30	Refreshment Break . . . . Lobby Lounge
10:30– Noon	"A Rationale and Purpose for Career Education" —Dr. Bruce Shertzer, Professor and Head, Department of Counseling and Personnel Services, Purdue University, West La Fayette, Indiana
Noon– 1:00 p.m.	Lunch . . . . (on your own)
1:00– 3:00	Symposium: Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Career Education at the University of Georgia —Dr. Paul Torrance, Educational Psychology —Dr. Ray Bruce, Curriculum and Supervision —Dr. Charles Berryman, Social Science Education —Dr. L. Ramon Veal, Language Education —Dr. Horace Hawn, Elementary Education —Dr. Kenneth Ricker, Science Education —Dr. Ira Dickerson, Agricultural Education
3:00– 3:30	Refreshment Break . . . . Lobby Lounge
3:30– 5:00	Small Groups . . . . Rooms A, B, C, and D —Ms. Pat Dwinell, Ms. Pat Duttweiler, Mr. Jim Hurt, and Dr. Robert Ball will serve as group leaders. Please focus upon the following questions for discussion purposes and in preparation for Wednesday's activities. 1. How have the day's activities affected your concept of career education? 2. Has the University of Georgia Team provided you with ideas for the implementation and fusion of career education into Teacher Education? 3. Have the activities tended to bring into focus needs, questions, and concerns relevant to your professional activities? What are these?
6:00	Dinner

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21

8:00– 9:15 a.m.	Breakfast (Preparation for Visits) . . . . First Floor Conference Room
9:30– Noon	Worksite Visits
Noon– 1:15 p.m.	Lunch . . . . (on your own)
1:15– 1:45	Introductions to Small Groups
1:45– 3:00	Small Group Sessions . . . . Rooms A, B, C, and D —Dr. E. Paul Torrance, Sociodrama —Dr. Paul Vail, Bread and Butterflies Approach —Ms. Pansy Torrance, Future Problem Solving Program —Dr. Ronald Harper, Community Resources in Career Education
3:00– 3:30	Refreshment Break . . . . Lobby Lounge
3:30– 5:00	Repeat of above sessions
7:00	Dinner. . . . . First Floor Conference Room Speaker: Ms. Sara N. Richardson, Associate Director, Project Interact, Steven F. Austin University

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22

8:30–10:00 a.m.	Career Education and Public Schools —Dr. Charles M. Hill, Superintendent of Schools, Crawford County —Ms. Dianne Moore, Middle School Counselor, Crawford County —Dr. Jerry Purser, Director, Vocational-Technical Education, Clarke County Schools
10:00–10:30	Refreshment Break . . . . Lobby Lounge
10:30– Noon	Small Group Sessions on Strategies and Curriculum Materials. Rooms A, B, C, and D
Noon–12:45 p.m.	Seminar Leaders: Business, Industry, Labor, and Education
12:45– 2:00	Luncheon Evaluation and Follow-Up Visit Planning. . First Floor Conference Room

SPONSORED BY

The University of Georgia
College of Education
and
a grant from the Office of Career Education of the U. S. Office of Education

CONFERENCE ADMINISTRATION:

Director, Dr. J. A. Williams, Dean College of Education, University of Georgia

Co-Director, Dr. Fred H. Holt, Director, Student Personnel Services, College of Education, University of Georgia

Paul R. Kea, Coordinator, College of Education Programs in Continuing Education
will represent the Georgia Center for this conference activity.

The University of Georgia continues its policy of non-discrimination on the basis of sex in compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 in all activities and programs under its sponsorship. In addition, the University of Georgia is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Career Education for Teacher Educators

February 20-22, 1978

The University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education / Athens

APPENDIX E

1. Pre-Post Opinionnaire
2. In-House Evaluation, Conferences by Days
3. Guide/On-Site Interview

CAREER EDUCATION OPINIONNAIRE*

Part I Background Information

1. College or University ______________________________

2. Department ____

3. Primary Role: (1) ____ Instruction (2) ____ Department Chairman
(3) ____ Administration (4) ____ Other ______________
(please specify)

4. At what level are the majority of your students?
(1) ____ Undergraduate (2) ____ Graduate (3) ____ Not Applicable
(4) ____ Other ______________

5. What is your present degree of understanding of career education?
(1) ____ None (3) ____ Moderate
(2) ____ Slight (4) ____ Extensive

6. What has been your involvement in career education?
(You may check more than one)

(1) ____ In-Service program
(2) ____ Department meeting
(3) ____ Reading-Please list any significant books
or articles you recall:
(4) ____ Service to local ____________________
school districts
(5) ____ Conference ____________________
(6) ____ Workshop
(7) ____ Classroom activities ____________________
(8) ____ No direct involvement

____

7. What emphasis do you feel should be placed on career education in educational programs at your institution in the next three to five years?

(1) ____ Increased emphasis
(2) ____ Same emphasis
(3) ____ Less emphasis
(4) ____ Undecided

8. Do you have direct involvement in teacher and/or counselor education programs here at your institution?

(1) ____ Yes (3) ____ Other (please specify) ________________
(2) ____ No

____

---

*From Wager, J. Patrick "Faculty and Administrative Attitudes toward the Integration of Career Education into the University of Wisconsin - Stout Curriculum," Center for Research and Education Improvement, University of Wisconsin - Stout, Menomonie, Wisconsin, September, 1974. (with minor revisions)

Part II How Do You View Career Education?

Please react to the following list of possible elements of a definition as they represent your opinion of career education. Rate each element according to the following code:

1----Strongly Disagree with the element
2----Disagree with the element
3----Undecided about the element
4----Agree with the element
5----Strongly agree with the element

Career Education: (Please feel free to comment on any element rated 1 or 2)

1. is an integral dimension of education starting in kindergarten?. 1 2 3 4 5
   Comment:

2. extends through adult and continuing education 1 2 3 4 5
   Comment:

3. provides opportunities for each individual to develop a realistic perception of his/her own unique capabilities (self-awareness) 1 2 3 4 5
   Comment:

4. provides a system to acquaint individuals with occupational opportunities (the world of work) available to him/her through exploratory experiences. 1 2 3 4 5
   Comment:

5. provides a system to prepare individuals for entry and re-entry into employment and/or continuing education. 1 2 3 4 5
   Comment:

6. enables individuals to develop career decision making/planning skills 1 2 3 4 5
   Comment:

7. provides opportunities to explore and appreciate leisure time activities. 1 2 3 4 5
   Comment:

Part II (continued)

Career Education:

8. assists individuals in the development of their preferred life style 1 2 3 4 5
Comment:

With the above in mind, how would you describe career education?

Part III Please react to the following statements as they apply to your campus, according to the following code:

1----Strongly Disagree with the statement
2----Disagree with the Statement
3----Undecided about the statement
4----Agree with the statement
5----Strongly Agree with the statement

1. Career education should be integrated into all levels and facets of education. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Future teachers and counselors should be provided with experiences which show the relationships between subject content and the world of work. 1 2 3 4 5

3. The concepts of career education should be integrated into existing teaching method courses. 1 2 3 4 5

4. We are too subject oriented and fail to provide future teachers and counselors the knowledge and skills needed to humanize education. 1 2 3 4 5

5. As I look at career education, I see it as a high priority for the program with which I am closely affiliated 1 2 3 4 5

6. If given the needed support, I would be interested in becoming involved in career education program development. 1 2 3 4 5

7. Too much emphasis is being placed on career education when you consider all of the goals of education. . . . 1 2 3 4 5

8. All future teachers and counselors should possess a working knowledge of career education within their specialty before graduation. 1 2 3 4 5

Part III (continued)

9. A course should be made available to each university student relating his or her major to the life style related to that work role. 1 2 3 4 5

10. Career education is a fad. 1 2 3 4 5

11. Career education has limited implications for future teachers of academic subjects (Math, English, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5

12. I am familiar with the U.S. Office of Education Models for Career Education 1 2 3 4 5

13. The basic philosophy of career education, as I view it, is sound and worth implementing. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Each department that offers courses for education majors should offer a course that will provide students with the relationship between its subject area(s) and the world of work. 1 2 3 4 5

15. Orientation to the world of work is sufficient in our present teacher and counselor education curriculum. 1 2 3 4 5

16. The number of career education concepts introduced into a course should be at the option of the instructor 1 2 3 4 5

17. Each program director should define career education as it relates to his/her own program 1 2 3 4 5

18. I am familiar with the career education resource materials available at our university. 1 2 3 4 5

19. Career education limits student options. 1 2 3 4 5

20. A university definition of career education should be developed beginning with each department's definition of the concept 1 2 3 4 5

21. Discussion and specification of strategies to further develop and integrate career education on our campus should be a high priority. 1 2 3 4 5

22. In order to better implement career education on our campus, I would like:

    (1) In-service training sessions offered. 1 2 3 4 5

    (2) More information regarding on-going career education programs in the state 1 2 3 4 5

Part III (cont'd)

(3) More information regarding on-going career education programs in neighboring states and in the nation. 1 2 3 4 5

(4) Specific ideas to integrate career education into existing courses. 1 2 3 4 5

(5) More instructional materials 1 2 3 4 5

(6) A clearer campus definition of career education. . 1 2 3 4 5

(7) More published material about career education as it applies to my subject area. 1 2 3 4 5

(8) More information from local school districts concerning their career education needs. 1 2 3 4 5

(9) A College or University Career Education Instructional Resource Center. 1 2 3 4 5

(10) More information relative to the present involvement and future plans of other departments on this campus relative to career education 1 2 3 4 5

(11) More advice on local production options, A.V., computer, text-on-demand, etc. 1 2 3 4 5

(12) Other ____

____

____

24. Leadership for career education on this campus should be the responsibility of: (Please rank 1-4, with "1" corresponding to the position of greatest responsibility)

(1) ____ An interdisciplinary team (representatives of each school).

(2) ____ Department chairman.

(3) ____ Central Administration.

(4) ____ School of Education

(5) ____ Academic Deans.

(6) ____ Program Director.

(7) ____ Program Committee

(8) ____ Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

(9) ____ A coordinator for Career Education.

Part III (cont'd)

(10)____ Other: (Please specify) ______________________________

(11) ____ Other: (Please specify) ______________________________

Part IV Please respond to the following statements by marking an X in the appropriate space provided.

1. I feel potential problems in integrating career education into programs on my campus are the following:

(1) ____Faculty apathy towards career education

(2) ____Lack of time

(3) ____Misconceptions about career education

(4) ____Lack of administrative support for career education

(5) ____Lack of adequate information concerning career education available to faculty

(6) ____Resistance to curriculum change

(7) ____Resistance to change on the part of the faculty

(8) ____Resistance to change by subject oriented departments

(9) ____Resistance to change on the part of the administration

(10) ____Lack of relevancy of career education

(11) ____Lack of commonly accepted university definition

(12) ____Other: ______________________________

2. To more effectively integrate career education into our college or university programs, I feel the following tasks will need to be completed:

(1) ____Develop an in-service program and/or workshop for faculty development relative to career education

(2) ____Identification and dissemination of available on-campus career educational resources.

(3) ____ Identification of needs relative to career education by individual departments

(4) ____Development of a commonly accepted definition of career education for this institution.

Part IV (cont'd)

(5) _____Identification of on-campus monetary support for career education.

(6) _____At least one course in career education should be required for teacher-counselor certification.

(7) _____More effort to sell university administrators on the need for career education.

(8) _____Faculty acceptance of the philosophy of career education.

--------- ----------------

Thanks much for your time and cooperation.

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

In order for us to provide experiences that will be beneficial to you and future participants, we are interested in your comments concerning the day's activities. Please respond to the following questions:

1. Did you have any problems concerning transportation and housing facilities that need to be brought to the attention of the Career Education Project Staff?

2. Did you have an opportunity to read the advanced material mailed to you? Yes_____ No _____ If yes, do you have any comments about this material?

3. How did you react to Edwin Herr's keynote remarks as an appropriate opening to the conference?

4. From your frame of reference, was the morning panel representative of community concerns regarding career education? Yes_____ No_____ Did you have any recommendations concerning the panel?

5. Do you have any comments regarding the usefulness of the afternoon program?
   A. Symposium

   B. Small group sessions

6. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the conference schedule?

7. Any additional comments?

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

In order for us to provide experiences that will be beneficial to you and future participants, we are interested in your comments concerning the day's activities. Please respond to the following questions:

1. What worksite did you visit?

   Reliance Electric Co. _____
   Citizens and Southern Bank _____
   Westinghouse Electric Corporation _____
   Georgia Power Co. _____
   Dupont Co. _____

   Was your visit a worthwhile experience?

2. Did the public school participants on the World of Work panel offer additional insights in the role of teacher educators in the area of career education? Yes_____ No_____ Any recommendations concerning this panel?

3. Which of the small group sessions did you attend?

   Use of Sociodrama _____
   Community Resources in Career Education _____
   Future Problem Solving Program _____
   Bread and Butterflies _____

   Did you find this session useful?

4. Do you have any recommended changes for future conferences?

CONFERENCE EVALUATION SCALE

Please rate the following activities by circling the appropriate number.

	Least Valuable						Most Valuable
1. Speech by Edwin Herr	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Panel: Representatives of Business, Industry, and Education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Symposium: Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Career Education at the University of Georgia	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Small Group Sessions (Monday)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Worksite visits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. World of Work and Career Education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Small Group Sessions (World of Work/ Career Education)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Small Group Sessions (Sociodrama, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Dinner Speaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Strategies and Curriculum Materials Sessions (Wednesday)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Informal Interactions with Conference Participants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Did your concept of career education change as a result of your attending this conference? Yes_____ No _____ If so, how?

Do you have any suggestions for improving future conferences of this nature?

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

In order for us to provide experiences that will be beneficial to you and future participants, we are interested in your comments concerning the day's activities. Please respond to the following questions:

1. Did you have any problems concerning transportation and housing facilities that need to be brought to the attention of the Career Education Project Staff?

2. Did you have an opportunity to read the advanced material mailed to you? Yes______ No______ If yes, do you have any comments about this material?

3. Do you have any comments about the Introductory activities?

4. How did you react to Edwin Herr's keynote remarks as an appropriate opening to the conference?

5. Do you have any comments regarding the usefulness of the afternoon Program?
   A. Symposium

   B. Small Group sessions

6. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the conference schedule?

7. Any additional comments? (use back if needed)

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

In order for us to provide experiences that will be beneficial to you and future participants, we are interested in your comments concerning the day's activities. Please respond to the following questions:

1. What worksite did you visit?

Citizens and Southern Bank ______
Westinghouse Electric Corporation ______
Georgia Power Company ______
Dupont Company ______
Southern Bell ______

Was your visit a worthwhile experience?

2. Which of the small group sessions did you attend? (1st session)

Use of Sociodrama ______
Community Resources in Career Education ______
Future Problem Solving Program ______
Bread and Butterflies ______

Did you find this session useful?

3. Which of the small group sessions did you attend? (2nd session)

Use of Sociodrama ______
Community Resources in Career Education ______
Future Problem Solving Program ______
Bread and Butterflies ______

Did you find this session useful?

4. Do you have any recommended changes for future conferences?

CONFERENCE EVALUATION SCALE

Please rate the following activities by circling the appropriate number.

		Least Valuable						Most Valuable
1.	Introductory Activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Speech by Edwin Herr	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Symposium: Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Career Education at the University of Georgia	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Small Group Sessions (Monday)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Worksite Visits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Small Group Sessions (Sociodrama, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Dinner Speaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Strategies and Curriculum Materials Sessions (Wednesday)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	Career Education and Public Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Panel: Representatives of Business, Industry, Labor, and Education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Informal Interactions with Conference Participants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Did your concept of career education change as a result of your attending this conference? Yes______ No______ If so, how?

Do you have any suggestions for improving future conferences of this nature?

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

In order for us to provide experiences that will be beneficial to you and future participants, we are interested in your comments concerning the day's activities. Please respond to the following questions:

1. Did you have any problems concerning transportation and housing facilities that need to be brought to the attention of the Career Education Project Staff?

2. Did you have an opportunity to read the advanced material mailed to you? Yes______ No______ If yes, do you have any comments about this material?

3. Do you have any comments about the Introductory activities?

4. How did you react to Bruce Shertzer's keynote remarks as an appropriate opening to the conference?

5. Do you have any comments regarding the usefulness of the afternoon program?
   A. Symposium

   B. Small group sessions

6. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the conference schedule?

7. Any additional comments?

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

In order for us to provide experiences that will be beneficial to you and future participants, we are interested in your comments concerning the day's activities. Please respond to the following questions:

1. What worksite did you visit?

Citizens and Southern Bank ______
Westinghouse Electric Corporation ______
Georgia Power Company ______
Dupont Company ______
Southern Bell ______

Was your visit a worthwhile experience?

2. Which of the small group sessions did you attend? (1st session)

Use of Sociodrama ______
Community Resources in Career Education ______
Future Problem Solving Program ______
Bread and Butterflies ______

Did you find this session useful?

3. Which of the small group sessions did you attend? (2nd session)

Use of Sociodrama ______
Community Resources in Career Education ______
Future Problem Solving Program ______
Bread and Butterflies ______

Did you find this session useful?

4. Do you have any recommended changes for future conferences?

CONFERENCE EVALUATION SCALE

Please rate the following activities by circling the appropriate number.

	Least Valuable						Most Valuable
1. Introductory Activites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Speech by Bruce Shertzer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Symposium: Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Career Education at the University of Georgia	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Small Group Sessions (Monday)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Worksite Visits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Small Group Sessions (Sociodrama, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Dinner Speaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Strategies and Curriculum Materials Sessions (Wednesday)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Career Education and Public Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Panel: Representatives of Business, Industry, Labor, and Education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Informal Interactions with Conference Participants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Did your concept of career education change as a result of your attending this conference? Yes______ No______ If so, how?

Do you have any suggestions for improving future conferences of this nature?

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

1. Do you have any comments concerning Sarah Richardson's dinner speech?

2. Did the public school participants on the Career Education and Public Schools panel offer additional insights in the role of teacher educators in the area of career education? Yes______No______ Any recommendations concerning this panel?

3. With whom did you work during the stragegies and curriculum materials session? ______________________________ Any comments?

4. From your frame of reference, did the representatives from business, industry and labor offer insights into how educators can prepare students for the world of work? Yes______No______ Do you have any comments?

Career Education for Teacher Educators

Evaluation
University of Georgia Participants

1. Do you have any comments concerning the December conference?

2. Do you feel that those matters which concerned you were improved or eliminated in the January conference? Yes_____ No_____

3. Do you have any comments about the January conference?

4. In what ways might the February conference be improved?

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS
EVALUATION

University of Georgia Participants

1. Do you have any comments concerning the February conference?

2. Visits to participating institutions will be made during Spring quarter. The proposal states that these visits will "reinforce the achievement of the objectives" (basically, the formulation of plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into pre-service programs) and "provide information and support for a career education emphasis" in such programs. We are in the process of preparing an orientation meeting and materials including a report form, to assist UGA staff members during these visits.

   Do you have any comments regarding what whould be determined, emphasized, asked, etc. during these visits?

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

EVALUATION GUIDE/ON-SITE INTERVIEW

Conference Participant ____________________

Institution ____________________ City ____________________

Position ____________________

Primary Responsibilities ____________________ ____________________

Interviewer ____________________ Date ____________________

I Awareness of Georgia Model (Questions to ask participant)

a. How would you define Career Education?

b. What do you see as the role of Career Education in the public schools?

c. What is your understanding of the Georgia Career Education Model to which you were exposed? (List any specific competencies mentioned)

II. Implementation of Model (Since attending UGA Conference)

Have you attempted to use career education materials for concepts in your teaching? If so how?

Have you talked with others either formally or informally about career education?

III. Site Visit Activities (Interviewer's Section)
What did you do while on site visit?

Did you feel this visit accomplished a worthwhile objective? If yes, what?

What is your overall impression of the individuals involvement and interest in career Education?

Was there any evidence of change as a result of participating in the project?

APPENDIX F

1. Overview of Purposes and Materials
2. Selected Bibliography
3. Subject Area Infusion Guide

Career Education Project for Teacher Educators:

An Overview of Purposes and Materials

This packet includes an Instructor's Guide, readings and other materials which will provide:

1. An explanation of the importance and utility of Career Education.
   Instructor's Guide pp. 14-24
   Career Education: Selected Readings for the Teacher Educator
   Envelope 1

2. Insight into the use of "occupational clusters" as a means of understanding the variety of available careers; trends in employment practices; and how careers affect life styles.
   Instructors Guide pp. 26-31
   Envelope 2

3. A review of the American economic system and a future prospective.
   Instructor's Guide pp. 32-38
   Evnelopes 3 and 4
   Future Problem Solving and Career Education
   by E. Paul Torrance

4. An examination of four different approaches to Career Education.
   Instructor's Guide pp. 40-50
   Envelope 5

5. An opportunity to evaluate the Matrix of Student Learner Outcomes and to plan a course outline to provide teacher competencies to accomplish these outcomes.
   Instructor's Guide pp. 52-54
   Envelope 6
   Helping Prospective Teachers Attain Career Education Competencies

6. Some teaching strategies particularly useful in infusing Career Education into subject area courses.
   Instructor's Guide pp. 56-61
   Envelope 6
   Sociodrama in Career Education by E. Paul Torrance
   Discovering and Using the Strengths of the Disadvantaged and Culturally Different by E. Paul Torrance
   Helping Prospective Teachers Attain Career Education Competencies

7. Suggestions on how to use community resources and work-site visits to add relevance to subject area courses.
   Instructor's Guide pp. 62-63
   Envelope 6

8. Evaluation procedures
   Instructor's Guide pp. 65-70
   Envelope 7

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

CAREER EDUCATION PROJECT

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This article is partially based upon project activities conducted under a grant or contract from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the article was written by Patricia L. Dwinell in her private capacity. No official support or endorsement by the Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 Public Law 92-318, states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, career education projects supported under Sections 402 and 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

Prepared by:
Patricia L. Dwinell
Career Education for Teacher Educators Project
Sponsored by:
College of Education, University of Georgia
and
U.S. Office of Education, Office of Career Education

University of Georgia
Career Education Project

Selected Bibliography

There is an abundance of documents available in the area of career education. This selection is representative of books and monographs published since 1970. It does not include journal articles or microfilm materials.

Arizona Department of Education. Career education matrix. Phoenix, Arizona: Author, 1973.

Bailey, L.J., & Stadt, R.W., Career education: New approaches to human development. Bloomington, Ill.: McKnight, 1973.

Begle, E.P. et al., Career education: An annotated bibliography for teachers and curriculum developers. Palo Alto, California: American Institute for Research, 1973.

Bell, T.H., & Hoyt, K.B. Career education: The USOE perspective. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, 1974.

Benson, A.M. Implementing career education programs. Division of Instruction Pupil Personnel Services Section. Minnesota Department of Education, 1975.

Benson, A.M. A resource guide for career development in the senior high school. Minneapolis: Minnesota Department of Education, 1973.

Black, M. & Schreiber, R. Lower school curriculum guide Career Education Monograph Series. Raleigh, North Carolina: National Center for Occupational Education, 1973.

Bolino, A.C. Career education; Contributions to economic growth. New York: Praeger, 1973.

Borow, H. Career guidance for a new age. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Bradley, L.D. Career education and biological sciences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Brickell, H.M., Aslanian, C.B., Grossman, R., Spak, L.J., Callaway, M., & Smith, K.S. Taxonomy and profiles of career education. New York: Policy Studies in Education, 1974.

Campbell, R. The career planning and support system. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, 1975.

Career Development, Guidance, Counseling and Placement Project Newsletter, Summary reports of state activities Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, August, 1972.

Career education: A report of the North Carolina Career Education Task Force. (Curriculum/Administration Series). North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1973.

Career education in Florida. An Official Department of Education Position Paper. State of Florida, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, October, 1973.

Career education in Kansas. A five year report of demonstration programs, 1970 to 1975. Kansas State Department of Education, 1975.

Career education mini-conferences. The Center for Vocational Education. Prepared for the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Career education, programs & progress. A report on U.S. Office of Education Activities in Career Education in Fiscal Year 1972. Washington, D.C.: The Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1974.

Center for Vocational and Technical Education. Developmental program goals for the comprehensive career education model. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University 1972.

Chenault, J. Career education and human services. Monographs on Career Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Career Education, 1975.

Cosgrove, G. Career planning: Serach for a future. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto, 1973.

Cunha, J.E. et al (Eds.) Career development: A California model for career guidance curriculum K-Adult. Fullerton, California: California Personnel and Guidance Association, 1972.

Dallas Independent School District. A survey of current research and literature on career education. Arlington, Texas: Author, 1972.

Davenport, L. & Petty, R. (Eds.) Minorities and career education. Columbus, Ohio: Hagnesworth, 1973.

Denues, C. Career perspective: Your choice of work. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1972.

Developing career in the elementary school. A Merrill Professional Textbook in Career Programs Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill, 1973.

Development Associates. Handbook for the evaluation of career education programs. Washington, D.C.: . Author, 1974.

Drier, H.N., Jr. and Associates. K-12 guide for integrating career development into local curriculum. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1972.

Drier, H.N. (Ed.) Career development resources; A guide to audiovisual and printed materials for grades K-12. Worthington, Ohio: C.A. Jones, 1973.

Dunn, A.J., Stell, L., Melnotte, J.M., Gross, D., Kroll, J., and Murphy, S. Career education: A curriculum design and instructional objectives catalog. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, 1973.

Dunn, C. J., & Payne, B.F. World of Work. Dallas: The Leslie Press, 1971.

Educational Leadership, October 1976, 34 (1), entire issue.

Evans, R., Hoyt, K.B., & Mangum, G. Career education in the middle/junior high school. Salt Lake City: Olymbus, 1973.

Even, B.B. Integrating career education into teacher preparation: Implementation guide for college/university use. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Ewens, W.P., Seals J.M., & Dobson, J.S. Elementary school career education and system-wide programs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Farmer, H.S. & Backer, T.E. New career options for women: A counselor's sourcebook. New York: Human Sciences, 1977.

Garner, D.P. (Ed.) The career educator. Charleston: 1975.

General Learning Corporation. Career education resource guide. Morristown, New Jersey: Author, 1972.

Gibson, R.L. Career development in the elementary school. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972.

Ginzberg, E. Career guidance: Who needs it who provides it who can improve it. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Golden, L Occupational awareness through dramatic play: A curriculum guide for primary grades. Chapel Hill, North Carolina Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina, 1973.

Goldhammer, K. & Taylor, R.E. Career education Perspective and promise. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972.

Gysbers N.C., Drier, H.N., Jr., & Moore, E.J. Career guidance: Practice and perspectives. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1973.

Hansen, L.S. Social aspects and considerations of career education. Washington, D.C , USOE Institutes for Curriculum Personnel Development, 1972.

Hansen, L.S. & Gysbers, N.C. (Eds.) Personnel and Guidance Journal, Special Issue. Career Development: Guidance and Education, 53 (9), May 1975

Hansen, L.S., Klaurens, M.K. & Tennyson, W.W. Life styles and work: A career education resource guide. St Paul: Minnesota Department of Education, 1972.

Herr, E.L. The emerging history of career education: A summary view. Washington D.C : National Advisory Council on Career Education, 1976.

Herr, E.L. Review and synthesis of foundations for career education. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1972

Herr, E.L. Vocational guidance and human development. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Herr, E.L. & Cramer, S.H. Conditions calling for educational reform: an analysis. Monographs on Career Education. Washington D C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Career Education. 1975.

Herr E.L. & Cramer, S.H. Vocational guidance and career development in the schools: Toward a systems approach. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Hoyt, K.B. Application of the concept of career education to higher education: An idealistic model. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976.

Hoyt, K.B. Career education: Contribution to an evolving concept. Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1975.

Hoyt, K.B. The school counselor and career education. (Monographs on Career Education, U.S, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Hoyt, K.B., Evans, R.N., Mackin, E.F. & Mangum, G. Career education: What it is and how to do it. (2nd ed.) Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1974.

Hoyt K.B. & Hebeler, R. (Eds.) Career education for gifted and talented students. Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1974.

Hoyt, K.B. & Pinson, N. Career education and the elementary school teacher. Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1973.

Hoyt, K B. & Woodward, G.G. Upper school curriculum guide. Career Education Monograph Series. Raleigh, North Carolina: National Center for Occupational Education, 1973.

Jervis R. & Swanson, G. Professional development. Career Education Monograph Series. Raleigh, North Carolina: National Center for Occupational Education, 1973.

Jesser D.L. Career education: A priority of the chief state school officers. Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1976.

Keller, J. Career education in-service training guide. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Corporation, 1972.

Kosuth, J. & Miltonberger, J. Teaching for career decision-making. Tustin, California: Diversified Counseling Services, 1972.

Kroll, A.M., Dinklage, L.B., Lee, J., Morley, E., & Wilkon, E.H., Career development: Growth and crisis. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1970.

Lewis, C. Activities and publications of the American Personnel and Guidance Association in relation to career education. Washington, D.C., APGA, 1974.

Life career development: A model for relevant education. Developed by a group of North Carolina educators appointed by the State Department of Public Instruction, Division of Pupil Personnel Services, 1974.

Magisos, J.H (Eds.) Career education. Third Yearbook of the American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association, 1973.

Mangum, G.L., Becker, J.W., Coombs, G., and Marshall, P. (Eds.). Career education in the academic classroom. Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1975.

Marland, S.P., Jr. Career education: A proposal for reform. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Marland, S.P., Jr. Career education: Retrospect and prospect. Sponsored by the Center for Vocational Education, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1975.

Maryland State Board of Education. Career education: A handbook for implementation. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Meyer, S. and the Career Education Task Force, Career education: A position paper. Nebraska State Department of Education, 1972.

Morgan, R.L., Moore, A.B., Shook, M.W. & Sargent, B. (Eds.) Synopses of selected career education programs: A national overview of career education National Center for Occupational Education, 1972.

Morgan. R.L. & Shook, M. A manual for the implementation and administration of career education programs. Career Education Monograph Series. Raleigh, North Carolina: National Center for Occupational Education, 1973.

Mumford, D. (Ed.) Career education: Suggested school-industry programs Warren City Schools, Ohio, 1975.

McClure, L. & Buan, C. (Ed.) Essays on career education. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

McClure, L. Career education survival manual: A guidebook for career educators and their friends. Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1975.

McCormack, E.J., Pool, L.J. & Tiedeman, D.V. A handbook for the preparation of educational personnel in career education. In contract with the Illinois Office of Education, Department of Adult, Vacational and Technical Education, and Northern Illinois University, 1976.

McLaughlin, D.H. Career education in the public schools 1974-75: A national survey. A report prepared by American Institutes for Research, Career Development Research Program for the National Advisory Council on Career Education and the Office of Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

National Institute of Education. Education and work task force, Fiscal year 1977 program plan, 1976.

National Institute of Education: Forward plan for career education. Research and development. Prepared by the Career Education Development Task Force, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, April 1973.

Olson, P.A. The liberal arts and career education. Monographs on Career Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Career Education, 1975.

Osipow, S. H. Theories of career development. New York: Appleton - Century - Crofts, 1968.

Peters, H.J. and Hansen, J.C. (Eds.) Vocational guidance and career development. New York: Macmillan, 1971.

Pettig, J.L. Career exploration and decision. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974.

Plumley, D. & Dunn, J.A. Teacher's guide to career education. Pala Alto: The American Institutes for Research, 1974.

Prince George's County Board of Education, Community resources: A partnership in career education, Upper Marlboro, Md., 1975.

Pucinski, R.C. and Hirsch, P. (Eds.) The courage to change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Rapp, M.A. & Barber, J.E. Career education-plans and programs of the states-1976. Moravia New York: Chronicle Guidance Publications, 1976.

Ressler, R. Career education: The new frontier. Worthington, Ohio. Charles A. Jones, 1973.

Rubsam, P.F., Jr. Career education in the environment. Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1972.

Ryan, C.W. Career education: A handbook of funding resources. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Ryan, C.W., Saltzmann, G.A., and Wysong, H.E Career education program. Palo Alto, California: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Scherer, R.T., & Clary, J.P. Middle school curriculum guide. Career Education Monograph, Vol. 2. Raleigh, North Carolina: Center Occupational Education, 1973.

Shertzer, B.E. Career exploration and planning. Boston: Haughton Mifflin, 1973.

The School Counselor, November 1973, 21 (2), entire issue.

Stadt, R., Bittle, R., Kenneke, L. & Nystrom, D. Managing career education programs. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Smoker, D.S. Career education: Current trends in school policies and programs. Arlington, Virginia: National School Relations Association, 1974.

Stevenson, J.B. An introduction to career education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1973.

Stone, S.C., & Shertzer, B. (Eds.) Career information and development. Guidance Monograph Series, New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970-1971.

Super, D.E. Career education and the meanings of work. Monographs on Career Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Taylor, J.E., Montague, E.K., & Michaels, E.R. An occupational clustering system and curriculum implications for the career education model. Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization, 1972.

Tennyson, W.W., Hansen, L.S., & Klaurens, M. Career education resource guides. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Education, 1972.

Tennyson, W.W., Hansen, L.S., Klaurens, M.K., & Antholz, M.B., Educating for career development, Pupil Personnel Services, Division of Instruction, St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Education, 1975.

Texas Education Agency. Basic learner outcomes for career education. Austin; Texas: Author, 1973.

Tiedeman, D.V. (Ed.). Career education and the technology of career development. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research, 1972.

Tolbert, E.L. Counseling for career development. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Turnbull, W.W. (Ed.). Conference on career education. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Career education. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Vetter, R.S. Career guidance materials: Implications for women's career development. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, 1974.

Walz, G.R., Smith, R.L. & Benjamin, L. (Eds.). A comprehensive view of career development. Washington, D.C.: APGA Press, 1974.

Wigglesworth, D.C. (Eds.). Career education: A reader. San Francisco: Canfield, 1975.

A Guide for Infusing Career Education Into Public School Subject Area Courses

Competency III calls for the prospective teacher to "Assist students to see and develop relationships between what they are being asked to learn in school and potential future careers". One way of doing this is to infuse career concepts into subject area courses. In order for the prospective teacher to infuse career concepts into a specific course lesson plan, it is first necessary to clarify the contribution made by the course and the relevance of the course to occupational or life goals.

One way of accomplishing this clarification process is offered here.

Patricia Duttweiler
Career Education Project
University of Georgia

DISCLAIMER

This article is partially based upon project activities conducted under a grant or contract from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Helath, Education, and Welfare. However, the article was written by Patricia Duttweiler in her private capacity. No official support or endorsement by the Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.

A Guide for Infusing Career Education into Public School Subject Area Courses

Course:

Grade level:

Ability level:

For each course:

1. Identify the general contribution the course makes to living a more satisfying life.

2. What percentage of your students will benefit from this course if they do not go to college?

3. List the ways you can relate this course to life outside of school for students who are not interested in knowledge for the sake of knowledge.

4. List the occupations to which this course can be directly or indirectly related.

5. List the parts of the course that are particularly relevant to the "real world", and explain how (or why) they are relevant.

6. For each unit or section of the course prepare lesson plans which will include an investigation, explanation or discussion about:
   a. the course's utility outside of school
   b. What types of occupations use the subject matter presented by the course?

An Example:

Course: Introduction to Sociology

Grade level: 11 & 12 High School

Ability level: Average

1. General contribution (rationale)

   Helps student understand how the society in which they are raised influences their behavior & attitudes; Investigates the social institutions which have evolved to meet the needs of the society and the group influences which affect the individual.

2. 100% in some way

3. Discuss practical value of understanding how behavior is influenced by groups
   Discuss means of social mobility - and consequences
   Help students to understand who makes up "society"
   Help students to understand cultural differences & thereby develop a more open-mined, less prejudiced attitude toward others.

4. All occupations - understanding group influences and pressure to conform and an understanding of social organization
   Specifically: Teaching, health professions, social work, anthropology, ministry, journalism, business, management, counseling, law, sales

5. Relevant parts

   a. Study of cultural difference - why people are different
   b. Study of group influence - examination of family peer, and reference group influence on behavior; social norms and roles
   c. Effects of social class - how occupation, education & income affect life-style and social mobility
   d. Social institutions - how basic needs of a society are met; how occupations develop from primitive to complex societies; how education transmits skills and knowledge needed by each society.

Sample Lesson Plan #1

Objectives:

1. The student will complete Handout
2. The student will participate in class discussion on how special groups can influence an individual's life choices.

Materials:

Handout assigned for homework on previous day. Handout containing following:

1. Types of groups: Primary, Association, Peer, Reference
2. Give one example from your own experience for each type of group.
3. Explain how your career choices could be affected by each example-group.
4. What influence could each example-group have which could lead to a more successful career?

Classroom Strategies:

1. Do necessary classroom administrative activities
2. Open discussion with question - "Do you think your family could influence you to go into a job that made you really miserable?' How? Why or Why not?
3. Assist discussion flow by inserting one of the Handout questions when momentum begins to die.

Evaluation:

1. The discussion will indicate the degree to which the student can associate the concept of group influence with actual life experience.

Sample Lesson Plan #2

Objectives:

1. The student (in groups or individually) will visit a worksite.
2. The student (in groups or individually) will choose three of the occupations at the worksite and interview or observe those engaged in each occupation and complete the "On-site Work Visit Questionnaire".
3. The student will participate in class discussion of the "Questionnaire" in order to assess the relevance of the course, and school in general, to the world of work.

Materials:

1. Questionnaire handed out at least two weeks before the class discussion period.

Classroom Strategies:

1. Begin with a general survey of worksites visited.
2. List occupations observed on board.
3. List skills & knowledge on board and discuss how course contributes.
4. List work habits on board & discuss how these relate to school work habits.
5. Discuss what personality traits contribute to success or failure in different occupations. (Can this be related to school?)
6. Discuss rewards/satisfactions available in different occupations, implications for life style and how education level influences the degree of satisfaction.

Evaluation:

1. The discussion will indicate the students' perception of the relevance of the course to the world of work.

APPENDIX G

Newsletters

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
December 1977

Conference Comments

The Career Education for Teacher Educators project is funded by U.S.O.E. for the purpose of dissemenating techniques for teacher educators to formulate plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into their pre-service teacher education programs.

Three conferences have been planned (Dec.11-14,1977; Jan.22-25,1978; and Feb.19-22, 1978) which will bring teacher educators from a six state area (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee) to the University of Georgia. Scheduled activities include small group discussions on differing approaches to Career Education, using community resources and using materials and techniques appropriate to infusing Career concepts into course plans. An on-site work visit to a local business or industry is planned to illustrate the variety of occupations available in the local community and how these can be used in Career Education.

Arrangements have been completed for the December conference. Dr. Edwin L. Herr, The Pennsylvania State University, and Ms. Sharon Colson, Texas A & M University, will be major speakers and other selected professionals will be involved.

The December, January and February conferences have reached their capacity. We regret that we cannot accept any more applications. For further information contact Dr. Fred D. Holt, Co-Director, Career Education Project, Room 122 Aderhold, University of Ga. Athens, Ga. 30602 Phone: 404-542-3003

Insight

E. Paul Torrance, Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Georgia has evaluated the results of the Institute of Career Development of the Georgia Governor's Honors Program, an on-campus six-week summer program for outstanding students who have been recommended from schools throughout the state.

A Career Awareness component was incorporated in the 1976 and 1977 program. In addition to devoting time to the students' area of specialization, the following three components emphasizing career education and futurism were included: 1) scientific and technological implications for the 21st Century man; 2) Western man's social and political culture, and 3) Career Education opportunities to explore specific careers and educational routes to the careers, and a practical study of job survival skills.

The evaluation conducted by Dr. Torrance found that in spite of the fact that only 17% of the participants at the beginning saw a need for investigation skills regarding the exploration of careers, 72% felt they had acquired such skills at the end of the program. Another finding shows only 35% of the students saw a need for obtaining career information at the start of the program. Interviews afterward indicated that 79% felt they had acquired such information.

Career Education On A Shoestring

From: Phi Delta Kappan (Vol. 59, No. 3
November 1977 page 203.)

El Camino High School in South San Francisco, California, involved the parents of it's 1,400 students in a career counseling program. The students were asked to list the occupations in which they were interested. Principal Robert Keropian then enlisted the aid of the PTA in tabulating the occupations of the students' parents. Over 90% of the occupations in which students said they were interested were found among those listed by parents.

Career Education On A Shoestring (cont.)

Parents were phoned and asked if they would serve one hour per month as a career consultant in their field of employment. Students signed for small, informal group sessions with someone actually holding a job in a career of interest to the student. As interest in the counseling sessions grew, some parents-experts brought in materials, invited students to visit their place of business and some students were eventually asked to do part-time work in their field of interest.

And no money was spent! Keropian was quoted saying, "Schools are spending a fortune on career education and career counseling already, and most of it is being wasted. I could probably get a bundle from the Feds to support my program, but I don't need it". For further information contact:

Robert C. Keropian, Principal
El Camino Senior High School
1320 Mission Road
South San Francisco, CA 94080
Ph.: 415-589-6372 Ext. 261

Rome City Schools Fund Own Program

Ms. Helen Smith has been director of the Career Education program ever since its introduction five years ago into the Rome, Georgia, City School System. The program was funded for the first two years by the state but for the past three years the program has been wholly funded by the City School System.

Career Education is accomplished through a set of student objectives and teacher competencies in a comprehensive K-12 program. Through progressive steps the concepts of Career Awareness (1-6), Career Exploration (7-8), and Career Preparation (9-13), are introduced by classroom teachers and school counselors.

The program includes several unique features. One is a Career Record begun in the 8th grade and continued through the 12th. This record includes a listing of skills to learn; places to enter information on jobs held and career goals; and a running account of absences and tardies in a section subtitled "working toward my goal". Another feature of the program is a working internship for which the student receives social science credit. Students who are interested may work 2 hours a day (without pay) in areas of interest to them. The jobs are arranged by Ms. Smith with area businesses.

For more information contact:

Mrs. Helen Smith, Director of Pupil Services
Rome City School System
Rome, Georgia

What's New and Useful?

***Free Film: "What Will I Do With My Time?" This color film runs 28 minutes and is useful with 8th grade thru adult groups. Visually stimulating, the film shows people from walks of life working and talking about their ambitions, feelings and their varied routes for getting where they are now. A teacher's guide is available. Distributed by:

Association Films, Inc. 866 Third
Avenue, New York, New York 10022

***University of Georgia's Journal of Research and Development, Summer 1978, edited by E. Paul Torrance will deal with the evaluation of the elusive aspects of Career Education.

***Partners in Career Education

From Texas this useable, practical set of materials has been designed with sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of any school district to enhance and complement the ongoing curriculum. Some of the volumes available are: The Career Education Implementation Guide contains descriptive information about the various components of the program. The Career Education Workshop Leaders' Guide is a staff development guide for a series of workshop sessions designed to provide classroom teachers with the knowledge and skills necessary for conducting classroom activities which infuse career education concepts into existing subject matter areas. There is a Career Education Workshop Participants' Guide for those attending the workshop. The Teacher-Developed Infused Curriculum Modules is a collection of six volumes which illustrate how career education concepts can be infused into various subject areas and grade levels - for example one book contains learning modules (lesson plans) for a variety of Social Studies courses grades 7-12. For more information write to:

Partners in Career Education
1201 N. Watson Road, Suite 130
Arlington, Texas 76011
817-640-1785

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
February 1978

CONFERENCE COMMENTS

Two of the three Conferences on Career Education for Teacher Educators have been completed and plans completed for the final conference.

December 11-14, 1977 Conference:

University of Georgia's Dr. J.A. Williams, of the College of Education, opened the conference with a welcome to the participants. Dr. Paul Torrance, Head of the UGA Educational Psychology Department gave an overview of the project and what it was hoped the conference would accomplish.

Dr. Edwin L. Herr, Professor and Head, Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, gave the major address of the day "A Rationale and Purpose for Career Education." Dr. Herr traced the history of Career Education, some of the objections brought out by various groups and presented some implications for the future.

Professors from the University of Georgia who had been active in the planning stage of the project participated in a Symposium in the Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Career Education. They shared their experiences in developing college courses to include Career Education concepts. The members of the symposium were:

Dr. Paul Torrance; Educational Psychology
Dr. Charles Berryman; Social Science Education
Dr. Ira Dickerson, Agricultural Education
Dr. Horace Hawn; Elementary Education
Dr. Kenneth Ricker; Science Education
Dr. Ramon Veal, Language Education.

Other activities included a panel discussion by members of the community representing business, labor, industry, and education; a visit by all conference participants to an industry or business in the community; and small group sessions to investigate techniques to use in the classroom when infusing Career Education.

Mrs. Sharon Colson, Assistant Director, Career Education for Gifted and Talented, Texas A & M University was the dinner speaker and also moderated a discussion of Career Education concepts in the public schools.

The participants were encouraged to work out a plan for infusing Career Education into their courses. Small groups were headed by members of the University of Georgia team.

* * * * * * * * * * *

January 22-25, 1978 Conference:

The January Conference on Career Education for Teacher Educators was conducted January 23-25, 1978 with participants representing Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Based upon evaluations from the participants in the December Conference and local faculty and staff several changes were made in the program format. The result was, what appears to have been a very successful conference. Fortunately, most participants were able to return to their homes without severe weather problems.

February 20-22, 1978 Conference:

The final conference of this series is scheduled for February 20-22, 1978. At this time, it appears that approximately fifty teacher educators will attend from the six state area. Dr. Bruce Shertzer, Purdue University will be the keynote speaker on Monday, February 20, 1978. The project staff is anticipating a meaningful conference with another fine group of teacher educators.

* * * * * * * * * * *

BULLETIN BOARD KITS

From Career Guidance Media, Alexandria, VA, - A series of Career Fields bulletin board sets which cover the 15 USOE occupational clusters. Each set includes a Career Information Guide poster which gives address to write for information about various types of occupations within a cluster; a Career Chart containing occupations within a cluster according to the level of training required; and several smaller posters which illustrate the type of work done in each occupation.

* * * * * * * * * * *

INDUSTRIAL ARTS AND CAREER EDUCATION

Dr. Harry T. Smith has developed materials for use in presenting career education concepts into the Elementary Industrial Arts curriculum. Dr. Smith indicates that in-service and pre-service workshops can be tailored in length of time and depth of study with hands-on activities for the participants. For further information contact:

Dr. Harry T. Smith
Program Supervisor
Vocational-Technical Education
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, TN 38501

* * * * * * * * * * *

WHAT'S NEW AND INTERESTING?

New Career Options for Women, Helen S. Farmer and Thomas E. Backer, Human Sciences Press, New York, 1977.

There are three books available in this series, a Counselor's Sourcebook, a Selected Annotated Bibliography and Women's Guide. The Sourcebook is designed to provide timely information for use by Counselors in the area of Career Opportunities for Women; legal rights of women related to the world of work; counseling techniques and strategies; and current research findings on women in the work force.

New Career Options: A Woman's Guide is designed to give to clients for reading on their own. It is a short, easy-to-read summary of the Sourcebook.

* * * * * * * * * * *

There are a number of publications which may be obtained from ERIC which seem worthy of consideration. Titles and numbers such as the following are available.

117522 A Staff Development Manual for Career Education
130118 Community Resources for Career Education
133470 Career Education Activities for Subject Area Teachers

As with any movement in education, there is an abundance of material with a career education focus. Therefore, the problem becomes one of selection and this is best done by the individual consumer. Those participants in the Career Education Conference who examined the ERIC reports know which ones are appropriate for their use but if one has not examined the publication it is suggested that an individual read summary statements or comments prior to purchase, if possible.

Monograph Series IX, edited by Shertzer and Stone, Career Education and the Curriculum appears to contain considerable material useful to practitioners. The monographs in the series focus upon the relationship of career education and various subject matter areas. This series is worthy of examination by those who are involved in the infusion of the concepts of career education into specific teaching activities.

* * * * * * * * * * *

PROJECT STAFF VISITS:

Beginning shortly, March in fact, the total staff of the project will begin visits to each of the campuses of the participants in the three conferences. Project personnel will be communicating with faculty members in the participating colleges and universities during the next few weeks. We are looking forward to these visits.

* * * * * * * * * * *

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
April 1978

PROJECT'S PROGRESS

With the completion of all three conferences the time has come for our visits to those institutions which sent participants to the conferences. Visits will be made to each institution by either a member of the University of Georgia faculty team or a member of the project staff. We anticipated problems in scheduling so many visits but have been delighted at the responses from all involved.

The visits have been designed to serve several purposes. First, they will serve as a follow-up to the Conference activities related to the infusion of Career Education concepts into courses. Secondly, the visiting team members will give any assistance possible with career education related problems and concerns. And, finally, the visiting team members will assist with any special professional activities if notified prior to the visit.

Several visits have been completed by members of the project staff and they have been very encouraging. Various activities which have a Career Education base, have been incorporated into programs or courses by a number of the participants in the Conferences. It is certainly a pleasure to see or hear about the infusion of career education concepts into ongoing courses. Two interesting activities which were occuring were (1) the involvement of local business and industry in a particular course and (2) the support and encouragement of Deans of some colleges for the career education movement.

We are looking forward to other visits to various campuses to learn of the activities in which members of the Conference groups may be engaged.

CAREER EDUCATION ACTIVITIES AROUND THE COUNTRY

Sex Stereotyping in Colorado

The Jefferson County Public Schools have been awarded a grant to demonstrate the most effective methods in career education to reduce sex stereotyping in career choices. The project "Placement of Junior and Senior High School Students in Non-Traditional Career Exploration Experiences in the Community", will be conducted from October 1, 1977 through September 30, 1978. The Project's objectives are:

To prepare and deliver a staff in-service program which provides training in sex-fair counseling and use of the curriculum materials.

To develop curriculum materials which increase student awareness of sex-role stereotyping and broaden perceptions of non-traditional career options.

To implement the program and evaluate it's effectiveness.

To disseminate information about the project, including materials and evaluation results, through local, state, and federal agencies.

For more information contact:
Dr. Robert E. Blum, Project Director
or Ms. Linda Doyle, Project Specialist
Jefferson County Public Schools
Career Education
1209 Quail Street
Lakewood, Colorado 80215
(303) 231-2369

* * * * * * * * * * *

Handicapped Children

KHAN DU! is a success model through television for the career education of handicapped children. It is designed to provide a continuing vigorous and affirmative message for children inclined to view themselves as handicapped, by showing them people with the same or similar impairments who are living and working in productive and fulfilling ways in a variety of occupations and life styles. It will also provide a learning resource guide to help students, parents, teachers, and others, to fully utilize the programs and to extend their awareness of the field of career education for handicapped children.

For further information contact:
Roy Cravens, Project Director
KLRN-TV, P.O. Box 7158
Austin, Texas 78712
(512) 836-0441

* * * * * * * * * * *

Visits to a Professional School

The Career Development Center at the University of South Carolina at Spartanburg has developed a program through which students who express an interest in or are pursuing a course of study designed to gain them admittance to a professional school (law, medicine, dentistry, etc.) can visit such a school in order to learn more about its requirements and activities.

Purpose The program is designed to meet the individual students' needs in compliance with his/her interest and career objective and provide a structured approach to visiting a professional school. It may include individual conferences with instructors in several subject areas, counselors in career planning, and special seminars with individuals who are in the practice of the profession. Overall it is a program planned to provide a meaningful experience in the professional school visit.

Origin To initiate a program of this type the administrator should identify the students who are interested and who will benefit from this program, then hold group meetings, clearly lay out the objectives, and openly accept student responses and objectives.

References In group discussions students focus on course descriptions, fundamental operations of the career, areas of employment, education requirements, examinations and practical responsibilities.

Pre-Conference Group Having selected the group, a pre-conference is conducted with students and interested instructors. The instructors recommend certain areas or laboratory skills that should be observed during the visit.

Countdown Meeting The host institution prepares schedules for the group. A review is made with students, instructors, and the counselor.

Visit Actual visit to school.

Follow-up Conference Immediately upon return to campus a group session is conducted with the students and interested staff.

For additional information contact:
Earl Gordon, Counselor-Instructor
Career Development Center
University of South Carolina at
Spartanburg
Spartanburg, SC 29393
(803) 578-1800 Ext. 412

* * * * * * * * * * *

Games That Teach: A Method of Motivating Students

In this article from *Man, Society, Technology: A Journal of the American Industrial Arts Association* (November 1977, Vol. 37, No. 2, 6-9) Lewis D. Kieft and Harry T. Smith discuss the advantages of using gaming as a means of motivating students.

"A major purpose of gaming is to provide students with learning opportunities which may not otherwise exist in typical classroom lectures or discussions. Some of these opportunities include: making major decisions while experiencing true-to-life situations; learning the consequences of certain actions without actually suffering from them; testing previously developed hypothesis; interacting and cooperating with other class members; demonstrating leadership; and physically moving around, thus eliminating much of the restlessness in many classrooms. Perhaps the greatest benefit of using gaming activities in the classroom is the increased motivation of the students. The assumption is made that students who are highly motivated will usually learn more about the topics involved than will students who are not as motivated."

"Several staff members and students of the Department of Industrial Education at Eastern Michigan University designed "Articon" - an educational game that appears appropriate for use in a variety of industrial arts laboratories and grade levels."

"The objectives developed were designed to help students obtain a better understanding of: 1) The function and operation of industry 2) Various relationships of industry with other institutions, such as the community, the government, systems of finance, etc. 3) Careers and occupations related to industry 4) The economics of buying, processing, and selling materials or products and 5) Personal money management and investment."

"Pilot testing in the first junior high school quickly verified that Articon was a highly motivating and successful game. It was very encouraging to see junior high school students enthusiastically involved in activities such as buying, selling, and renting materials and equipment; conducting banking activities; forming competitive companies; writing and enforcing legislation; checking quality of products; and trying to conserve raw materials, all while playing a game."

Dr. Kieft is assistant professor in the Department of Industrial Education, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti.

Dr. Smith is assistant professor in the Department of Secondary Education and Foundations at the Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville.

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAREER EDUCATION

If you need materials on how to infuse career education into the classrooms write to:

The National Center for Career Ed.
University of Montana
P.O. Box 7815
Missoula, MT 59807

They have put together SAMPLER LIBRARIES of infusion materials. The SAMPLER LIBRARIES are made up of teacher prepared materials collected by NCCE from around the nation and judged to be the best examples of ways to infuse career education into the regular classroom. NCCE has a SAMPLER LIBRARY for grades K-3, for 4-6, for 7-9 and for 10-12. Each LIBRARY contains about 50 pieces of material covering 4 to 5 broad subject areas, and costs $90.00 Until one can actually handle a piece of material from the LIBRARY and realize the value of such materials to teachers, to administrators, to curriculum coordinators, and ultimately to the students, one cannot fully appreciate the worth of the SAMPLER LIBRARY. For that reason, they have put together a SAMPLER LIBRARY and written information about the physical makeup of the LIBRARY, with sketches of the LIBRARY setup.

****

SHARE YOUR IDEAS

If you have a program in Career Education that you feel is unique, new methods you are incorporating into your classes or any ideas on Career Education you would like to share with others, please drop us a line and we will print them in our June Newsletter. Sent to:

Pat Duttweiler
Career Education Project
College of Education
122 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

****

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
June 1978

CONFERENCE WRAP-UP

The Career Education conferences held in December, January and February at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education at the University of Georgia were designed to inform participants on the Georgia Model for Career Education. The four competencies explained in the Model were designed to help guide the infusion of career education concepts into teacher education courses.

The follow-up visits to the institutions which participated in the conferences were made to evaluate the effects the conferences had on the understanding of career education concepts; on the motivation to incorporate these concepts into teacher education courses; and the degree to which the conferences effected changes in the institutions' curricula planning. To expect 100% success; instant and overt enthusiasm; and joyful compliance with the aims of the conference would be somewhat unrealistic. It was no great surprise to us, therefore, that some participants went back to their home institutions with little enthusiasm for the concepts of career education. There were also some who gained in understanding but, nevertheless, have not incorporated the concepts in any planned way into their teaching. Others, have systematically added new units including career education concepts and techniques to courses they have previously taught.

What made the follow-up visits so rewarding to those of us who made the trips was finding many who were actively involved in using career education concepts to either revise their methods of teaching or to revise their curriculum. Many of the schools visited were planning summer workshops or credit courses in Career Education. Many others were revising their entire curriculum to include Career Education concepts at every level of teacher education.

A sample of some of the activities which are occurring are mentioned below:

**At Sacred Heart College, Belmont, NC, Sister Mary Christine has introduced CE concepts into the Introductory Education classes and incorporated them into the pre-student teaching class for Seniors.

**At Atlanta University, Atlanta, GA, Damaris Ouzts has designed a project for an in-service teacher course in which teachers from different urban schools, representing different subject areas develop units in CE for their particular area, and hold workshops at their schools in order to teach others in their subject area to infuse CE concepts.

**Charles Berry, Alabama State University, Montgomery, has Methods students research career potential in subject areas and role play.

**Carl Reade, Troy State University at Montgomery, Alabama is rewriting a course in Adult Education to include CE concepts.

**A course is being offered by North Georgia College, Dahlonega, for the teachers of migrant workers. Torrance's Discovering and Using the Strengths of the Disadvantaged and Culturally Different in Career Education is being used by Robert Saba in the course.

**Piedmont College, (Dr. Mary C. Lane), Demorest, GA, has injected CE into its teacher training program from orientation through the professional education sequence.

**Dr. Harry Smith (Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, TN), who has been involved in career education for several years, has several projects in the planning stages. He has used the materials from the conference for input into his position on the Career Education Advisory Council in Tennessee; developing an in-service project; and in an Elementary Methods course.

**Margaret Horton of Stetson University is working closely with the local schools in career education activities. Student teachers are using career education materials in their practice teaching. Also, she has been encouraging University Faculty to examine and utilize career education concepts in their courses. At the present time, efforts are being made to develop a program for adults in the community based on many of the concepts of career education.

There are numerous other fine things happening in the colleges and universities which participated in the conferences. However, it would not be possible to list all of the "happenings" which the project staff encountered on the visits.

The members of the staff of the Career Education Project for Teacher Educators at the University of Georgia want to express our sincere appreciation to all of you. We hope that you will continue to see Career Education concepts as a means for making subjects more relevant to the world outside the school and continue to develop the means by which they can be infused into subject area courses. We have gained much from our associations with all of you and it is encouraging to know that many of you gained more insight into Career Education through the conferences held at the University of Georgia.

* * * * * * * * * * *

CAREER EDUCATION AROUND THE U.S.

North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University (NCATSU) has developed a comprehensive Career Education Program. The program has three components:

1. An orientation program for all first year students.
2. A series of career seminars for upper class students.
3. Four courses (12 semester hours) in the Secondary Education Teacher Training Program.

The courses are:

1. Education 605, CONCEPTUALIZATION OF CAREER EDUCATION (Concepta).
2. Education 606, CURRICULAR INTEGRATION - FUSION OF CAREER EDUCATION (Methodology).
3. Education 607, ADMINISTRATION OF CAREER EDUCATION (Administration, Implementation, Coordination).
4. Education 608, SEMINARS IN CAREER EDUCATION (Research).

Course 1 was initiated in January, 1978. Course 1 and 2 will be offered during the summer session, 1978. Course 3 will be initiated in August, 1978.

In addition to the development of courses, Textual materials have been prepared for publication and instruction in these courses. For additional information contact:

Joseph A. Bennett, Director
Career Education Program
North Carolina A & T State University
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411
(919) 379-4574

Manatee Junior College: Florida

Bridging the Gap

Manatee Junior College is attempting to bridge the gap between secondary and post-secondary guidance activities through the development of an Experience Based Career Education (EBCE) program, unique to the needs of students at this level. Often dealing with students with a median age of 28, program coordinators Dr. Mary Green and Mrs. Barbara Jordan have been working closely with secondary educators in EBCE pilot schools in Broward, Orange, and Penellas Counties, Florida.

Their six months of hard work has now solidified into a program format. Modeled after the secondary effort, nine students are now enrolled in the EBCE course through the school's Career Psychology and COOP Programs. During the first three weeks, students participate in an intensive career guidance effort followed by community site placement which most nearly relates to their career choices. The Manatee Junior College program combines learning activities inside and outside the school into a balanced, comprehensive, individualized program for students - something not commonly found at many post-secondary institutions. For additional information contact:

Mr. Bill Ripley, Coordinator
Orange County Career Education Office
410 Woods Avenue
Orlando, Florida 32802
(305) 423-9225

Career Education Consortium: Wisconsin

Wisconsin Counsil of Professions Producing Slide/Tape Presentations

The Wisconsin Council of Professions recently set aside $4,000 to duplicate a series of slide/tape presentations on each of the eight professions represented in its council. The first in this FOCUS ON OPPORTUNITY series has been completed. It describes the important professional service of a CPA (Certified Public Accountant) and how he/she is supported by bookkeepers and accountants.

Slide/tapes to follow will be on professions in architecture, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine. The slides will be available to schools on a free loan basis from their related professional organizations. Business education teachers can obtain this first presentation on CPAs by contacting:

Carol McAvoy
Manager of Communications
600 E. Mason Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202

Adkins Life Skills: Connecticut

The Career Educationa Center at CES assists communities in developing a broad range of career education activities for early childhood through adult learners. The Center also helps individuals by making career education information readily available to them.

Resource materials at the Center, including films, filmstrips, training kits, and literature are available to students in the Life Skill Series.

Two aids which the Life Skills participants find quite useful in planning for their future careers are the "Job Lab II Series", and the "How To Be" films.

The "Job Lab II Series" features an alphabetized listing of careers. Each listing describes the working conditions, the duties and responsibilities, and the personal and educational qualifications related to each particular career.

The "How To Be" film series includes audio tapes, filmstrips, and guides for the examination of a variety of careers.

Bridgeport Community Career Education Center Opens

Since opening in January, Bridgeport's Career Education Center has been very active. Life Skills Classes using the Adkins Life Skills Series as a major curriculum have begun for day students at the Adult Learning Center, 100 Colorado Avenue, and for night students at Central High School from 7:30-9:30 P.M.

The program recently received a boost from the Connecticut State Department of Unemployment Compensation. The adjudication Division ruled that participation in day or evening Life Skills Classes would not jeopardize an unemployed person's benefits. It hoped that future participants may be referred directly from State Employment Agencies.

Building Your Tomorrows

"Building Your Tomorrows" was first developed at the Ohio State University's Center for Vocational Education. After its initial development, it was turned over to American Institute for Research (AIR) for field testing, revision and refinement. Through an N.I.E. grant and under the able directorship of Dr. Jim Dunn of Cornell University, AIR was able to perfect the material and make it ready for local school district use.

"Building Your Tomorrows" consists of thirteen printed modules that emphasize three strands: Learning About Self, Learning About the World of Work, and Goal Formulation and Personal Planning for grades K-12. Persons interested in acquiring detailed information should contact Mr. William E. Lowther, Marketing Director, American Learning Systems, P.O. Box 2173, 1106 Jeanette Avenue, Columbus, Georgia, 31906, Phone (404) 327-2619. Interested persons in Florida should contact Georgia Lucas at (305) 626-3075.

American Youth Magazine Available

"American Youth Magazine" is published and distributed to hish school seniors free of charge four times yearly by General Motors Corporation as a part of its commitment to promote system works and how they can take advantage of its career opportunities.

Principals or Senior Faculty Sponsors of U.S. high schools should contact:

Circulation Manager
AMERICAN YOUTH MAGAZINE
30400 Van Dyke Avenue
Seventh Floor
Warren, Michigan 48093

APPENDIX H

Report, Third Party Evaluation

An Evaluation

Of the

Career Education for Teacher Educators Project

This article is partially based upon project activities conducted under a grant or contract from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the article was written by F. Marion Asche in his private capacity. No official support or endorsement by the Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.

F. Marion Asche
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
And State University
Blacksburg, Virginia
August 10, 1978

The project "Career Education for Teacher Educators" was funded by the Office of Education through the Office of Career Education and was conducted by staff at the University of Georgia during the school year 1977-78. An earlier project, also funded by the Office of Education was carried out during the 1975-76 school year. Much of the present project was based on the "model" and materials developed during the earlier project.

Project Purpose, Goals, and Objectives

The evaluation was based on the purpose, goals and objectives as stated in the project proposal. Several of the original project objectives were changed after funding with concurence of the project officer so the original evaluation framework was modified to reflect the changes in objectives. As stated in the project proposal, the project had as its central purpose "To demonstrate that the University of Georgia's Career Education Staff Development Model for Teacher Educators is transportable to other teacher preparation institutions" (page 3, proposal). The principle thrust of the project, as stated on page 7 of the proposal was "to utilize the products of the 1975-76 funded project". The primary operational objective was stated on page three of the proposal as: "As a result of involvement in a study of the University of Georgia Teacher Educator Career Education Staff Development Model, about 150 faculty members from about 50 teacher education institutions will demonstrate their ability to formulate plans and strategies to infuse career education concepts into their pre-service teacher education programs." This objective was further explicated as: "More specifically each college faculty member will:

1. formulate a definition of the term "career education" which reflects consideration of the U.S.O.E. definition and the U.Ga. Model definition.
2. present arguments in favor of the position that career development concepts should be infused in the pre-service preparation of teachers.
3. Evidence an understanding of:
    a. the U.S.O.E. position as to the need for career education
    b. the difference between school-based and community-based career education programs.
    c. the state plan for his/her state for career education
    d. the University of Georgia model for pre-service training in career education.

. . . each faculty member will:*

4. evidence knowledge of the changing status of special segments of the population with the concomitant effects upon the life-styles of individuals.
5. show an understanding of the interrelatedness of career education to the future relationships of labor and management.
6. Demonstrate through sylabi or practice the ability to infuse career education into content courses.
7. utilize one or more of the University of Georgia Model com-

*Objectives 4-8 are the new objectives which were approved after project funding.

petencies and strategies in the infusion process of career education into course outlines.

8. report or demonstrate an improved or changed understanding of the concepts underlying career education.

Evaluation Methodologies

Three primary evaluative methodologies were selected to assess the project's accomplishment of the stated purpose, goals and objectives. The primary methodologies used for assessment of each major goal or objective are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 - Primary Evaluation Methodologies

Project Goal or Objective	Observation	Interview	Questionnaire
*Transportability of Model		X	X
Use products of 1975-76 project	X		X
Overall Objective	X (Plus project records)		
Formulate a definition		X	X
Present arguments for infusion			X
Understand: USOE position			X
Difference S-B and C-B			X
State Plan			X
UGa Model		X	X
Knowledge of changing status			X
Relationships of labor & management			X
Infuse career education (content courses)		X	X
Use UGa Competencies			X
Improved or changed understanding of CE		X	X

The evaluator visited the second conference, observed most of the sessions and informally interviewed fifteen of the participants. Project staff were interviewed at a later date after they had conducted a number of follow-up visits. In addition to conference observations and participant and staff interviews, an evaluation questionnaire was prepared and mailed to each of the participants in the three conferences at addresses supplied by the project staff. The results of several internal evaluation procedures carried out during the conferences by the project staff were reviewed.

Limitations

Three primary limitations should be kept in mind when reviewing the findings and interpretation which follow:

1. Time constraints did not permit the evaluator to attend all three conferences. Also, the same limitation prevented participation by the evaluator in the follow-up visits. The second conference was selected primarily on a convenience basis.
2. The return rate for the evaluation questionnaire was not as high as optimally desired. The time of mailing was deliberately chosen to allow time for follow-up visits to be conducted and to allow time for participants to act on what they had learned in the conferences. The timing did, however, in all probability limit the response rate to some extent in that several of the participating institutions had already recessed for the summer prior to or shortly after receiving the questionnaire. A second mailing produced minimal response. An overall response of 76 plus six incorrect addresses amounted to a response rate of 65%.
3. The actual level of implementation by participants at their home institutions could best be determined by project staff during the

follow-up visits. Staff were interviewed and their on-site data forms reviewed and several questions were included on the evaluation questionnaire regarding implementation. The accuracy of participants' self appraisal of implementation is unknown.

Findings

Conference Observations

The evaluator attended the January conference. This particular conference was attended as a matter of convenience without having seen either the conference program or the participant roster. Later information collected from participants and project staff indicated that this particular conference was probably the most successful in such areas as evaluation of the major presentors, compatibility of participants and overall tone of the workshop.

The primary purpose of attendence at the conference was to observe firsthand four elements: (1) was the central thrust of the conference and follow-up activities as proposed - namely "to utilize the products of the 1975-76 funded project", (2) were the procedures and activities indicated on the conference program actually carried out, (3) what was the general tone of participant reaction to these processess and activities and (4) to have some basis on which to judge the validity of data which were to be collected directly from participants at a later date.

Briefly, the observation indicated that the products of the 1975-76 project were the primary focal point (in particular the UGa "model") of the conference, the processes and activities indicated on the conference program were executed as planned, the general tone of participant reaction was very positive and finally, observations made during the conference proved to be congruent with data collected from participants at a later date.

Observations and informal interviews with participants indicated that the major speaker, Edwin Herr, was almost universally praised. There were a number of participants who felt they had quite a bit of experience with career education at the college/university level and seemed anxious to talk about these experiences. Several suggested that the group should have been divided according to experience/knowledge level. Although the project staff did not have control over who the participating colleges would send to the conferences, greater clarification to these institutions concerning selection criteria might have helped alleviate this problem. The project staff did not seem to expect this wide variance in background and experience of the participants.

Several participants commented that they would like to have had a little time to vist the UGa campus, talk with colleagues from other institutions in attendence, etc. These comments were reinforced by several unsolicited comments on the questionnaire about the "packed" schedule. Although desirable, such a time block would be most difficult to find in a two and one-half day conference. The small group sessions (second day) were either praised or damned, apparently according to the group leader rather than the topic. Some time was spent in each of these sessions by the evaluator and there was wide variance in both the level of preparation by the leaders and in the level of participation by those attending.

Overall, the conference was well organized and managed (see comments section, appendix A), participants were enthusiastic, and topics and presentors were well chosen. The primary criticisms by participants seemed to be that somewhat more attention should have been paid to the experience level of participants, some free time should have been provided and several of the more experienced participants seemed to be frustrated by the lack of opportunity to show and tell their accomplishments in career education. The overall positive tone which was observed during the conference was supported by the data collected later directly from participants.

The Questionnaire

The primary methodology employed was an evaluation questionnaire. One original focus of the evaluation was to review curriculum revision carried out by participants but the change in selected project objectives and format of the conferences made this method inappropriate.

The project was primarily concerned with transporting the UGa Career Education for Teacher Educators model to other institutions and convincing participants to implement aspects of that model in their home institutions. These proposed outcomes could not be measured during the conferences. Also, a major portion of the project resources were devoted to on-site follow-up visitations by project staff at the participants home college or university. It was deemed important by the evaluator, to the extent possible, to conduct the major assessment after the follow-up visits and after participants had had at least some time to initiate career education activity.

The questionnaire was designed around the major goals and objectives of the project. The first section dealt with the clarity, appropriateness, and helpfulness of the UGa model (question 1, a-c). The second asked participants to rate the conference they attended on the extent to which it helped them attain project sub-objectives 1 through 8 (question 2, a - h). The third section asked for participant self assessment of attitudes toward and implementation of the UGa model attributable to the UGa project (question 3, a - d). Questions four through six dealt with the participants' awareness of a state plan for career education and with the UGa follow-up visit. Question seven asked for participants' assessment of the usefulness of the career education products produced by the 1975-76 funded project. A final section simply asked participants to supply any comments they wished about the conference, products or follow-up visit.

Findings for each item on the questionnaire are presented in this section.

Question 1a - "Please rate the extent to which you feel the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Model is understandable"

The possible responses on this item (and on parts b and c) were from one (not understandable to five (very understandable). Mean response for the total group was 3.921 with means for conference groups one through three respectively of 3.483, 4.100 and 3.647. Responses at or above the mid point of the scale were ninety two percent of the total responses. Figure 1a is a summary of the data for the total group on this item.

Figure 1a - Clarity of the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Model

```
CODE
  2 |******* (      6)

  3 |********************* (      17)

  4 |************************************** (  30)

  5 |******************************** (    23)
    |    VERY CLEAR
    |
    |
    |
     FREQUENCY 10        20        30        40        50

    MEAN  3.921          MEDIAN 4.000              MODE 4.000
STD. DEV. 0.920
VALID CASES  76          MISSING CASES 0
```

Question 1b - "Please rate the extent to which you feel the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Model is appropriate for use with teacher educators in your institution"

This item was also scaled on a five point scale with a response of one indicating that the model was not appropriate to a response of five indicating the model was very appropriate. A total of 63 of the 76 (83%) respondents rated the appropriateness of the model at or above the mid point of the scale. Mean response for the total group was 3.526 with means respectively for the three conference sub-groups of 3.483, 3.667 and 3.353. One respondent rated the model as "not appropriate" for his/her particular institution. Figure 1b summarizes data from this item.

Figure 1b - Appropriateness of the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Model

```
CODE |
    1| ** (     1)
     | NOT APPROPRIATE
    2| **************** (      12)
     |
    3| ********************************* (      25)
     |
    4| ****************************** (      22)
     |
    5| ********************** (      16)
     |  VERY APPROPRIATE
     |
     |
     FREQUENCY    10         20         30         40         50

     MEAN    3.526           MEDIAN 3.500                MODE 3.000
 STD. DEV.   1.039
 VALID CASES   76            MISSING CASES 0
```

Question 1c - "Please rate the extent to which you feel the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Model is helpful in the formulation of plans and strategies for infusion of career education concepts in the preservice teacher education program"

A five point scale was again employed for item 1c with the ends of the scale representing not helpful to very helpful. The overall mean response was 3.737. Mean response by conference was 3.655, 3.833, and 3.706 respectively. A total of 67 (88%) of the respondents rated the model at the mid point of the scale or above. Figure 1c is a summary of data from the item.

Figure 1c - Helpfulness of the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Model

```
CODE
    2 ************ (     9)

    3 *************************** (     21)

    4 ********************************** (     27)

    5 ************************* (     19)




      FREQUENCY  10           20           30           40           50

   MEAN    3.737            MEDIAN 3.796                    MODE 4.000
STD. DEV.  0.971
VALID CASES   76            MISSING CASES 0
```

Question 2 - Please rate the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Conference you attended:"

Question 2 a - h was designed to assess the extent to which participants agreed that the conference they attended accomplished several of the specific objectives listed in the project proposal. Each of the items is presented below. The scale for each item was 1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - agree and 4 - strongly agree.

Question 2a - ". . . the conference was based on the UGa career education materials provided me"

Mean response for the total group to item 2a was 3.387 with individual conference means of 3.143, 3.500 and 3.588 respectively. Of the 76 respondents, 62 rated the item as either agree or strongly agree. Figure 2a presents summary figures and summary statistics for this item.

Figure 2a - Extent to Which Conference was Based on UGa Materials

```
CODE
    1 |*** (     1)
      |STRONGLY DISAGREE
    2 |**** (     2)
      |DISAGREE
    3 |************************************************ (      39)
      |AGREE
    4 |***************************************** (      33)
      |STRONGLY AGREE
    0 |** (     1)
      |MISSING
      |
      |
      |FREQUENCY   10           20           30           40           50

    MEAN    3.387                    MEDIAN 3.385                  MODE 3.000
STD. DEV.   0.613
VALID CASES    75                    MISSING CASES 1
```

Question 2b - ". . .extent to which the conference helped me acquire knowledge of the effects the changing status of special segments of the population has on the lifestyles of individuals"

Overall mean response on item 2b was 2,800 with means for conferences one through three of 2.786, 2.833 and 2.800 respectively. Approximately 31% of the respondents indicated disagreement with this item. Distribution of responses across the three conferences was quite uniform. Figure 2b presents mean data for this item.

Figure 2b - Extent to which conference helped participants acquire a knowledge of the effects of changing status of special segments of the population on the lifestyles of individuals.

```
CODE |
   1 |****** (     4)
     |STRONGLY DISAGREE
   2 |************************ (     19)
     |DISAGREE
   3 |************************************************* (     40)
     |AGREE
   4 |**************** (     12)
     |STRONGLY AGREE
   0 |*** (     1)
     |
     |
     |
      FREQUENCY  10          20          30          40          50

   MEAN  2.800             MEDIAN 2.862                 MODE 3.000
STD. DEV. 0.7771
VALID CASES   75           MISSING CASES 1
```

Question 2c - ". . .extent to which the conference helped me see and understand the relevance of career education to future relationships of labor and management"

The overall mean on this item was 3.053. Respondents from the second conference tended to be most positive with 90% rating the item either agree or strongly agree while 75% and 76% marked these alternatives in conference one and three respectively. Group means were 2.893 (first conference), 3.200 (second conference) and 3.059 (third conference).

Figure 2c - Ratings of extent to which conference helped participants see and understand the relevance of career education to future relationships of labor and management.

```
CODE
    1 ***** (     3)
      STRONGLY DISAGREE
    2 ************** (     11)
      DISAGREE
    3 ************************************************** (     40)
      AGREE
    4 ************************** (     21)
      STRONGLY AGREE
    0 ** (     1)
      MISSING



      FREQUENCY  10           20           30           40           50

   MEAN   3.053             MEDIAN 3.087                    MODE 3.000
STD. DEV. 0.769
VALID CASES  75             MISSING CASES 1
```

Question 2d - ". . .extent to which the conference changed or increased my understanding of the concepts underlying career education"

For the total group, less than 20% of the respondents disagreed with this statement. Thirty-seven percent indicated that they strongly agreed with the statement and 43% indicated agreement. Group means on item 2d were 3.276, 3.100, and 2.941 for conference one through three respectively.

Figure 2d - Change or Increase in Understanding of Concepts Underlying Career Education

```
CODE  |
    1 |**** (     3)
      |STRONGLY DISAGREE
    2 |*************** (     12)
      |DISAGREE
    3 |***************************************** (     33)
      |AGREE
    4 |*********************************** (     28)
      |STRONGLY AGREE
      |
      |
      |
      |
      |FREQUENCY  10           20          30            40          50

  MEAN   3.132            MEDIAN 3.197                     MODE 3.000
STD. DEV. 0.822
VALID CASES  76           MISSING CASES 0
```

Question 2e - "...helped me become aware of and understand the USOE position on the need for career education"

Approximately 75% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. One respondent failed to answer the item. There was however, a difference in the extent of disagreement among the three conferences. In the first conference, 39% indicated disagreement, 10% in the second conference were in disagreement and 29% of the respondents from the third conference indicated disagree. Mean scores on item 2e were 2.643 (first conference), 2.067 (second conference) and 2.706 (third conference).

Figure 2e - Awareness and Understanding of USOE Position on Need for Career Education

```
CODE
    1 ***** (     3)
      STRONGLY DISAGREE
    2 ********************* (     16)
      DISAGREE
    3 *********************************************************(    47)
      AGREE
    4 ************ (     9)
      STRONGLY AGREE
    0 ** (     1)
      MISSING

      FREQUENCY   10          20          30          40          50
   MEAN  2.827              MEDIAN 2.894                 MODE 3.000
STD. DEV. 0.685
VALID CASES  75             MISSING CASES 1
```

Question 2f - "...Made clear the differences between school-based and community based career education programs"

Overall response on this item indicates approximately 70% agreement and 30% disagreement with the statement. The second conference group had a lower level of agreement (63%) than group one (75%) or group three (70%). Mean response for groups one through three respectively were 2.929, 2.767 and 2.882. Figure 2f lists frequencies of response for each alternative for the total group.

Figure 2f - Clarity of Differences Between School-Based and Community-Based Career Education

```
CODE
   1 **** (     2)
     STRONGLY DISAGREE
   2 ************************** (    20)
     DISAGREE
   3 ************************************************** (    40)
     AGREE
   4 ***************** (    13)
     STRONGLY AGREE
   0 *** (     1)
     MISSING



     FREQUENCY   10           20           30           40           50

    MEAN  2.853                MEDIAN 2.887                     MODE 3.000
STD. DEV. 0.730
VALID CASES  75                MISSING CASES 1
```

Question 2g - "...helped me to understand the UGa model for pre-service training in career education"

There was almost 90% (89.3%) agreement with this statement for the total group. The three conference groups were very similar in the level of agreement with mean scores of 3.179, 3.200 and 3.118 respectively. One person in group one did not respond to the item. Figure 2f reports frequencies of response and summary statistics for the total group on this item.

Figure 2g - Helpfulness of the Conference in Understanding the UGa. Model

```
CODE
    1 ** (      1)
      STRONGLY DISAGREE
    2 *********** (      7)
      DISAGREE
    3 ******************************************************** (      45)
      AGREE
    4 **************************** (      22)
      STRONGLY AGREE
    0 ** (      1)
      MISSING


      FREQUENCY  10          20          30          40          50

    MEAN  3.173            MEDIAN 3.156                MODE 3.000
STD. DEV. 0.645
VALID CASES  75            MISSING CASES 1
```

Question 2h - "...helped me develop a personal definition of career education"

For the total group, 79% of the respondents indicated agreement with this statement. There was again, however, some difference between groups with group two indicating the highest level of agreement (87%) and group one (72%) and group three (75%) almost identical in their responses. Mean response for group one through three respectively were 2.931, 3.200 and 2.9[illegible]8. Figure 2h present frequencies and summary statistics for the total group on item 2h.

Figure 2h - Helpfulness of Conference in Developing a Personal Definition of Career Education

```
CODE |
   1 |******* (      5)
     |STRONGLY DISAGREE
   2 |**************** (      11)
     |DISAGREE
   3 |********************************************* (      35)
     |AGREE
   4 |******************************** (      24)
     |STRONGLY AGREE
   0 |** (      1)
     |MISSING
     |
     |        I          I          I          I          I
     |
     |FREQUENCY 10       20         30         40         50

   MEAN   3.040          MEDIAN 3.114                MODE 3.000
STD. DEV. 0.861
VALID CASES  75          MISSING CASES 1
```

Question 3a through 3d dealt with the participants' assessment of the impact of the particular conference they attended in combination with the UGa career education materials and the follow-up site visit on both their attitudes toward career education and their career education practices.

Question 3a - Extent of use of one or more of the four UGA career education competencies in course outlines

For the total group, eight respondents indicated that the question was not applicable on the basis that they do not work directly with course outlines. Six individuals indicated that they had not and did not plan to use the competencies in course outline revision. Thirty one (42%) responded that they plan to use the competencies and 29 (39%) indicated that they were presently using one or more of the four competencies in course revision.

Two individuals did not respond to the item. The level of negative response (coded 2 = I have not and do not plan to use...) for the three groups respectively was 0%, 13% and 12%. Overall and group averages are not meaningful for this item since 11% of the respondents indicated that they do not work directly with course outlines. Eliminating their responses from the analysis yields an overall mean rating of 3.348. Figure 3a presents the frequency of response to each alternative for this question.

Figure 3a - Reported Frequences of Use of UGa Competencies

```
CODE
    1 *************** (     8)
      NOT APPLICABLE
    2 ********* (     6)
      NO
    3 *************************************** (    31)
      PLAN TO USE
    4 ************************************* (    29)
      PRESENTLY USING
    0 ***** (     2)
      MISSING


      FREQUENCY  10          20          30          40          50
```

Question 3b asked participants to rate the impact of the project on their attitudes toward career education with the possible responses being 1 = more negative, 2 = not changed and 3 = more favorable. No respondents indicated that they had formed a more negative attitude toward career education as a result of the project, 22 or 29% indicated that their attitude had not changed and 53 or 71% indicated that they had formed a more positive attitude as a result of the project. Results across the three conference groups were consistant with group means of 2.714, 2.733 and 2.847 respectively. Figure 3b presents frequencies and summary statistics for the total group.

Figure 3b - Change in Attitudes toward Career Education as a Result of the Project

```
CODE
    2 **************** (     22)
      NOT CHANGED
    3 ************************************** (     53)
      MORE FAVORABLE
    0 ** (     1)
      MISSING






      FREQUENCY  20          40          60          80          100

   MEAN  2.707          MEDIAN 2.792                 MODE 3.000
 STD. DEV. 0.458
 VALID CASES  75        MISSING CASES 1
```

Question 3c asked participants to indicate the impact of the UGa project on their teaching practices, more specifically the extent to which they had infused career education concepts into their teaching practices in content courses as a result of participation in the project. Six persons indicated that the question was not applicable since they do not teach content courses. Eliminating these six responses from the analysis revealed that approximately 3% replied negatively to this item ("I have not infused career education concepts in my teaching of one or more content courses and probably will not), 26% indicated that they plan to and 70% selected the most positive option. Means for the three groups (with the not applicable responses removed) were 3.731, 3.714 and 3.533 respectively. It should be noted that group three was the last conference and had had less time to actually implement the infusion process. Figure 3c presents summary data for the total respondent group.

Figure 3c - Reported Infusion of Career Education Concepts in Content Courses

```
CODE |
    1|******** (     6)
     |NOT APPLICABLE
    2|*** (     2)
     |NO
    3|*********************** (     18)
     |PLAN TO
    4|********************************************************** (   49)
     |HAVE INFUSED
    0|** (     1)
     |MISSING
     |
     |
     |FREQUENCY  10          20          30          40          50
```

Question 3d attempted to determine participants' views (after having participated in the UGa project) regarding both the importance of a focus on career education concepts in the pre-service curriculum as well as the most appropriate approach. The project advocated an infusion approach in both the conferences and project materials.

For the total respondent group, four (05%) indicated that career education concepts would, for the most part, be learned by prospective teachers without any special emphasis in the curriculum. Eleven (15%) indicated that a specialized course should be used to teach the concepts and 58 (79%) indicated a preference for infusion as the primary strategy for teaching career education concepts. The percentage of respondents who indicated a preference for infusion in each group was 74%, 76%, and 93% respectfully. Figure 3d presents summary data for the total group.

Figure 3d - Attitude Toward and Preferred Strategy for Teaching Career Education Concepts in Pre-Service

```
CODE
     1 *** (      4)
       WITHOUT FOCUS
     2 ********* (      11)
       SPECIAL COURSE
     3 *********************************** (      58)
       INFUSION
     0 *** (      3)
       MISSING




      FREQUENCY  20          40          60          80          100

    MEAN  2.740              MEDIAN 2.871                  MODE 3.000
STD. DEV. 0.553
VALID CASES  73              MISSING CASES 3
```

Question 4 dealt with the existence of a state plan in the respondent's state and level of familiarity with that plan. There was a sharp increase in the number of persons who did not respond to this item, potentially because a "don't know" response alternative was not provided. Overall, response percentages were 26% (no response), 28% (no and 46% (yes). The second part of item four had a non-response of 47%, 24% indicated that they were not familiar with their state plan and 29% indicated that they were familiar with its major provisions.

Question five asked participants if they had been visited at their home institution by a UGa project staff member(s) and if they had, their appraisal of that visit. It should be noted that some participants may have received the questionnaire before the on-site visit had been conducted at their institution. Sixty six or 89% indicated that a site visit had been made. Of the 63 persons responding to the second part of question five (assessment of the on-site visit), 10 or 16% indicated that the follow-up was not particularly helpful, 38% indicated that it helped to reinforce or clarify what had been learned at the conference, approximately 10% indicated that it had helped them adapt the UGa model to their institution and 36% indicated that the visit had answered specific questions they had about career education in teacher education. Figure 5 is a summary of responses to the second part of question five.

Figure 5 - Primary type of Help Provided by UGa Follow-up Visit

```
CODE |
   1 |******************************* (      24)
     |REINFORCE
   2 |********** (      6)
     |ADAPT UGA
   3 |***************************** (      23)
     |ANSWER QUESTIONS
   4 |************* (      10)
     |NOT HELPFUL
   0 |****************** (      13)
     |MISSING
     |
     |
     |FREQUENCY  10          20          30          40          50
```

Question six asked if the UGa representative(s) met with other faculty during the follow-up visit. Ten respondents did not answer the question but of the 66 who did, 59 or 89% responded affirmatively.

Question seven asked respondents to rate the usefulness of the individual career education products furnished them by the project. These products were developed during the first funded project, 1975-76. A "not applicable - have not read" category was included to assess the level of use of the materials. The responses to this category for each of the products was (1) Selected Readings, 05%, (2) Helping Prospective Teachers, 09%, (3) Strengths of Disadvantaged, 19%, (4) Instructor's Study Guide, 14%, (5) Future Problem Solving, 07%, and (6) Sociodrama in Career Education, 14%. Table 6 presents the percent of response in each category for each product after removing the not "applicable" responses.

Product	Not Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful
1. Selected Readings	01	54	44
2. Helping Prospective Teachers	04	46	49
3. Strengths of the Disadvantaged	10	51	39
4. Instructor's Study Guide	05	52	44
5. Future Problem Solving	03	47	50
6. Sociodrama in Career Education	03	57	40

Figure 6 - Percent of Respondents Who Had Read UGa Career Education Materials Who Indicated Each Category of Response

The final item on the questionnaire asked respondents to supply any summary comments they wished about the conference they attended, the career education products provided by the project or the follow-up visitation by UGa Staff. It was indicated that comments would be classified, typed and supplied to the project staff in such a manner that anonymity would be guaranteed. All of the comments provided by respondents are included in the appendix to this report.

Interviews

Informal interviews were held with key staff members after they had conducted follow-up site visits. The following summary was written from tape recordings made with permission of the staff during the interviews.

Selection of Participants

Several observations were made about the wide range of career education experience by participants ranging from persons who had worked actively for several years in the area to those who were vaguely familiar with the term "career education". Some participants were apparently at the conference under protest. Also, however, a number of participants, especially from the smaller colleges, were pleased to have been selected. The third conference had a number of "no-shows" with staff feeling both the time of year and a high level of influenza may each have taken their toll. One staff member commented that the level of experience/expertise at which the conferences were aimed should have been made clearer in communications with the participating institutions.

On-Site Follow-up Observations

Staff indicated a generally warm tone to reception given them by most host campuses with just a few exceptions. Several were asked to speak to faculty groups assembled for that purpose. In one case the UGA staff member was asked to speak to the total faculty and in another case the faculty senate. Follow-up visiting staff commented that about all the participating institutions had done at least something about career education since their conference attendance. An estimate was given that about ½ were probably really using the competencies and materials almost exactly as intended.

Several of the college officials visited were interested and enthusiastic. General observation was made that the smaller institutions seemed to have more progress on implementation of career education than had the larger colleges and universities. One institution was in the process of infusing career education competencies from the model in every college of education course. One institution which was "cool" to on-site visitation had done quite a bit of work on infusion.

Project Operation

One staff member wad disappointed that pre-test data were not used to modify planned programs. This same individual, however, added that extensive adjustments were made during conferences based on daily feedback forms and observation. Format of the second conference was changed extensively based on evaluation of the first conference. Staff indicated that there had been some feedback that there should have been more "how-to" and less "we should" and "why we should". Opinion was expressed that programs were a little too packed with not enough free or informal discussion time.

Summary, Interpretation and Conclusions

Evaluation findings speak well for the management, processes and content of the conferences and project in general. The lack of direct measures of project impact prevent making conclusions beyond that indicated by staff and participant reports. Participants were overall quite complimentary in their assessment of the conferences both during their attendence and after conference "hawthorne" effect should have diminished.

Participant ratings of the clarity, helpfulness and appropriateness of the model were high with few negative ratings. One of the primary goals of the original funded project was to simplify the vast literature of career education and career development to a concise, understandable "model." Participant reaction indicates that this original goal was achieved.

The findings indicate a mixed reaction to the specific project subobjectives with lowest rating awarded to objective 3a (Figure 2e), objective 3b (Figure 2d) and objective 4 (Figure 2b). The evaluator's observations at the second conference indicated that objectives 3a -c, 4 and 5 did not receive a specific focus in the conference above that provided in the project materials and that which could be inferred from the two major panel discussions.

The major negative observation is that inadequate provisions were made for the very wide range of experience and attitude of the participants. The selection procedures could not control this variance in experience level of participants so more effort on the part of the project staff in this area probably would have been fruitful.

Overall, there is ample evidence to conclude that the UGA Career Education for Teacher Educators project did, to a high degree, successfully carry out its proposed activities and was successful in accomplishing major purposes. The extent of long range impact of the project on the participating institutions is unknown but at least a minimum level of technical assistance and follow-through with the most promising institutions would seem to be a good investment.

Comments Written in by Participants on Evaluation Questionnaire

The following comments were written in on the evaluation questionnaire. All comments, both negative and positive, are presented unedited in this section. (Comments are sorted according to conference and general content.)

A. First Conference

1. Personnel

-I feel the school system people brought in were not well informed.

-Some (1 or 2) presentors didn't seem to be well-informed or enthusiastic about the concept of career education.

-The director and staff were enthusiastic and helpful.

-Dr. Torrance was a real inspiration. All leaders in the conference seemed very prepared.

2. Materials

-I have a hunch that some of the material was pulled together quickly after notification of receiving grant. Material was good, but could have received more thought.

-The printed materials provided, explained career education far better than the participants at the first session.

-The materials were great.

-In the conference I expressed to Dr. Torrance my own view that perhaps the model developed by UGA was more oriented to the humanistic model than that which I had thought the USOE had had in mind. This would have been natural since most of the professors on that team were humanistically oriented more than for work. I felt myself that the USOE had at least emphasized more the aspect of a saleable skill as the ultimate goal and one more acclimated to our economic needs—particularly of the disadvantaged. I felt the GA model was somewhat lacking in this emphasis.

3. Processes

-Follow-up visit was thoroughly satisfactory.

-The follow-up visit was fine. The lady who visited really put us at ease and was so willing to hear comments or answer questions.

-The total involvement was beneficial.

-The tours of industries were especially meaningful.

-The visits to industrial plants were helpful in that they made the theory of career education meaningful.

4. Outcomes

-The conference more completely stabilized my concepts about career education.

-I have attended two additional workshops in Alabama since attending at the University of Georgia.

-I did not get any "new" concepts or ideas, however, I had already been introduced to career education before coming.

-The conference did cause us to do some things in our curriculum that we had considered doing earlier.

-Our institution has added a course in career education to its teacher education curriculum as a result of the conference.

5. Conference Planning and Organization

-Conference was well-planned.

-It was well organized and followed through.

-The timing of the conference in early December was not good. Most of us were tired after finishing a very busy fall quarter. The weather was miserable.

-I enjoyed the conference and felt that it was well-planned.

-The initial contacts at the conference and opening session were poorly planned. An overview stated enthusiastically, clearly, and concisely would have greatly enhanced my first impressions, and possibly my benefits.

-I thought the conference was excellent and well planned.

-Time was not provided beforehand to acquaint participants with the project and related materials.

-Individuals came with varying degrees of knowledge and were not grouped.

-This conference was a very poorly organized and managed conference.

-The conference itself was very well organized.

6. General Evaluative Comments

-There was much work involved.

-Superior conference. The entire conference was well organized, well executed, and completely beneficial.

-The workshop was very meaningful, stimulating, well organized and provided participants with an opportunity to see first hand how teacher education institutions can infuse career education into its pre-service program.

-The conference was meaningful.

-Very good conference.

-Minority concerns in career education were not stressed enough.

-The first conference, the one I attended, did not clarify purpose, was quite confusing to those who had no prior dealings with the concept. We spent too much time defining and defending "career education" — because of the lack of definition of purpose.

-Our primary need was to determine a means for organizing and coordinating our current career education efforts. Most of the conference time was spent convincing participants that career education was needed.

-My misgiving about the conference and follow-up may stem from my strong desire to cut down on unnecessary federal spending in order to approach a balanced budget.

-A follow-up study should be made within the next 18 months to measure the impact of the conference.

-I did note that there was no representative of the USOE, itself and I remarked on the lack, which I think was a definite lack.

-Participants were under a misconception that this was connected to the University of Georgia career center.

-Overall, it was O.K.

-The conference had a good cross-section of participants. Many were knowledgeable about the concepts of career education and shared their knowledge.

B. Second Conference

1. Personnel

-No comments received.

2. Materials

- The writings were too volumunous. Could have been condensed. I still haven't gotten thru them all.

-I think the conference and materials are very complete and clear in themselves.

3. -The follow-up visit by a staff member was particularly significant in providing support and evaluative perspectives concerning implementation and evaluation of the career education competencies.

-The greatest use of the conference to our college was the favorable third party influence on our Dean and some other faculty members in C & I by Dr. Berryman during his visit to us,

-Our biggest criticism of the University of Georgia conference was the unguided, seemingly purposeless trips to industry. These could have been very valuable if introduced and followed-up appropriately.

-It was helpful to have the follow-up visitation, but I'm not sure it was necessary.

4. Outcomes

-The career education model of the University of Georgia reinforced principles I needed to teach education and vocational guidance from K-12 and college and life-long learning.

-I am much much too busy with stupid academic trivia to give any time to program development - good or bad.

-I benefited from the University of Georgia conference because it reinformed my methods courses in elementary education. I was already infusing career education, but after the conference I was able to do it more effectively.

-The head of our department plans a course in career education for the summer session — a direct off-spring of the conference.

5. Conference Planning and Organization

-They started early and worked late. One more day would have killed us.

-I would have liked to have had more time for strategies in the classroom.

-A well-planned conference.

-Our conference was smooth and well-done.

-We could have used more released time. I would have liked to have visited the College of Education.

-The conference was well-planned.

-Very well conducted administratively! I appreciate the hard work put forth by the program leadership.

-Well-organized conference that provided a badly needed service for public education. There needs to be more of the same with a focus on school administrators than the teaching personnel.

-The University of Georgia did a good job with the conference. It was well run with excellent presentors.

6. General Evaluative Comments

-The conference was one of the most productive I have attended.

-The workshop at the University of Georgia was excellent and served its purposes effectively. It was all relevant and beneficial.

-The University of Georgia is to be commended for a fine conference. I have been pro-career education for several years. The University of Georgia has provided additional tools for one to use.

-I am acutely critical of career education and my favorable remarks stem from my attitude and perceptions in general rather than from their program.

-I _very_ much enjoyed the conference. I have been extremely involved in planning and implementing conferences myself and feel I could only rate this one as excellent in every aspect.

-Obviously, I believe in the infusion concept.

-The Athens Conference on Career Education was extremely helpful in clarifying and providing meaning for me in terms of the competencies being developed in effective career education systems and programs being infused.

-A superior conference. Extremely useful for helping me to sort things out and for clarifying some misunderstandings.

-Our efforts would have been helped much more if the representative from our campus had been from the content and methods teaching areas of C & I and/or Educational Foundations instead of vocational education.

-I already was quite active in promoting career education, so most of the University of Georgia conference ideas were not new to me. I already was including the ideas in guidance classes.

-I considered it an excellent learning activity. It was well-planned. It renewed my enthusiasm about career education.

-There was not enough emphasis on creative thinking.

-When we decided to attend the University of Georgia conference, we had already been committed for some time to a college-wide team approach to providing career education for pre- and in-service teachers, counselors and principals through a series of course modules in career education. It was interesting to see how Georiga's infusion model had been applied. But we had considered infusion several years ago and found it would not work on our campus. We feel we can reach more students, more effectively, by offereing the elective course sequence.

-We enjoyed the conference. We had a positive impression of the meeting and were pleased to have had the opportunity to participate.

-From my viewpoint and background, I felt too much time was spent in reviewing role and scope of career education and not enough concrete emphasis was proportionally placed on pre-service strategies.

-It was a bit discouraging to learn that other faculty had not picked up on the learnings generated by the faculty involved in this project.

C. Third Conference

1. Personnel

-The conference staff was efficient, effective and provided the participants with gracious assistance throughout the sessions.

-Dedicated and interested staff.

-The University of Georgia staff worked hard and were very knowledgeable.

-We evidently had the poorest workshop of those given. The major problem came with the "experts" brought in for so-called keynote addresses. They were poorly prepared and did a next-to-nothing job of presentation.

2. Materials

-The career education products were well chosen. They provide a comprehensive packet for developing and implementing career infusion in higher education curriculums.

-Most impressive feature of the program was the tremendous amount of materials and the quality of the materials prepared for the conference.

-Materials were generally adequate and useful.

3. Processes

-A follow-up visitor took us unaware during examinations, thus we did not meet. We have yet to start.

-I wish that more dynamic speakers could have participated.

-On-site visits most productive.

-Most of the presentations were worthwhile.

-Major speeches were too full of jargon.

-The industry visit was second best.

-Small group discussions were the best.

-Follow-up activities have not been adequately planned and acted upon.

4. Outcomes

-I am in the process of providing methods teachers printed materials in their respective area or level.

-I think that it acted or served as an "opener of the eye" for all who were not knowledgeable in this area or who had never been exposed to career education.

5. Conference Planning and Organization

-The conference was well-organized and addressed the goals in depth and clarity.

-The conference was well-organized.

-Atmosphere of friendliness and helpfulness.

-Dr. Holt handled the conference extremely well.

-Conference was well-organized.

-Conference was well-planned and executed.

6. General Evaluative Comments

-I was already very familiar with career education before I went to the conference. I wish there had been so-called "advanced" sessions for participants like me. Much of the conference dealt with things that I had studied and taught.

-A major shortcoming at the conference was the failure to clearly articulate career education concepts to persons who had little prior knowledge of career education. This was not a problem of mine. I have been involved in career education programs since 1972.

-Excellent physical facilities.

-Worthwhile displays.

-This form is not very applicable because my institution did not provide support for the University of Georgia follow-up; there was no problem with the University of Georgia.

-Too theoretical. Needs to be more practical in light of needs of participants.

-Too much social activity.

-Implementation was not very adequate.

-Conference lacked concrete goals/objectives.

-The conference gave me a lot of material. I have not had the opportunity to carry out or follow through with a plan to infuse (beyond my present level) career education in my own courses. It was already present in a substantial way. I do plan to be more systematic about it, however. The University of Georgia gave me so much material, that I have not yet attacked it, much less digest any. This may account for the low ratings on this survey. I enjoyed the program, and felt that I benefited from it.

-The assumptions supporting the system (infusion) are not valid to me. This made the experience pretty irrelevant to me. This is not a criticism of them -- many others may have gained useful insights.

-From my biased view -- the materials and workshop methodologies were far from the "cutting edge."

-We had a lousy group -- some of our participants were much too vocal!

-I did not find the conference particularly helpful. I had already done some work in career education and did not learn much which was new.

-I thought for awhile that I had gone with my expectations too high and too eager, but soon learned that I was not alone in my feelings of frustration.

-Everyone was gracious and most helpful.

-Opportunities were provided to allow for attitude change.

-Much information was made available.

Evaluation Questionnaire

CAREER EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

Evaluation Questionnaire

1. Please rate the extent to which you feel the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Model

a. Is understandable

Not Understandable	Very Understandable

b. Is appropriate for use with teacher-educators in your institution

Not Appropriate	Very Appropriate

c. Is helpfûl in the formulation of plans and strategies for infusion of career education concepts in the pre-service teacher education program

Not Helpful	Very Helpful

2. Please rate the University of Georgia Career Education for Teacher Educators Conference you attended:

(1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree)

	SD	D	A	SA
a. Was based on the UGa career education materials provided me	1	2	3	4
b. Helped me acquire knowledge of the effects the changing status of special segments of the population has on the lifestyles of individuals	1	2	3	4
c. Helped me see and understand the relevance of career education to future relationships of labor and management	1	2	3	4
d. Changed or increased my understanding of the concepts underlying career education	1	2	3	4
e. Helped me become aware of and understand the USOE position on the need for career education	1	2	3	4
f. Made clear the differences between school-based and community-based career education programs	1	2	3	4
g. Helped me to understand the UGa model for pre-service training in career education	1	2	3	4
h. Helped me develop a personal definition of career education	1	2	3	4

3. Please make an "X" in the blank next to the most appropriate response to each item below:

"As a result of attendence at the UGa conference, reading the UGa career education materials furnished me and/or the follow-up site visit by UGa project staff. . . .

a.
___ I have or am in the process of utilizing one or more of the four UGa competencies in the infusion process in a course outline or outlines
___ I have not at present but do plan to use one or more of the competencies for infusion of career education in a course outline or outlines
___ I have not and do not plan to use one or more of the competencies for infusion of career education in a course outline or outlines
___ I cannot answer since I do not work directly with course outlines

b.
___ I have formed a more favorable attitude toward career education
___ I have not changed my attitude toward career education
___ I have formed a more negative attitude toward career education

c.
___ I have, in my teaching practice, infused career education concepts into one or more of my content courses
___ I have not at present but do plan to infuse career education concepts into one or more of my content courses
___ I have not infused career education concepts in my teaching of one or more content courses and probably will not
___ I cannot answer since I do not teach content courses

(Over please for completion of questionnaire)

d. ___ I have decided that career education concepts will, for the most part, be learned by prospective teachers without any special focus in the pre-service curriculum

___ I have decided that career education concepts should be taught to prospective teachers in a specialized course in the pre-service curriculum

___ I have decided that career education concepts should be taught to prospective teachers primarily through the process of infusion into the regular pre-service curriculum

4. Does your state have a State Plan for Career Education? Yes ___ No ___

If it does, are you familiar with its major provisions? Yes ___ No ___

5. Have you been visited at your institution by a UGa project staff member or members? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, the follow-up site visit by UGa staff: (please X the most appropriate response)

___ Helped to reinforce or clarify what I learned in the UGa Conference

___ Helped me to adapt the UGa model to my institution

___ Was helpful in answering specific questions I had about career education in teacher education

___ Was not particularly helpful

6. Did the UGa representative(s) meet with other faculty at your institution? Yes ___ No ___

7. Please rate each of the UGa Career Education Products listed below in terms of its usefulness to teacher educators in your particular institution

(1 = Not Useful, 2 = Useful, 3 = Very Useful, 4 = NA, have not read)

	NU	U	VU	NA
a. Career Education, Selected Readings for the Teacher Educator	1	2	3	4
b. Helping Prospective Teachers Attain Career Education Teacher Competencies.	1	2	3	4
c. Discovering and Using the Strengths of the Disadvantaged and Culturally Different in Career Education	1	2	3	4
d. The Instructor's Study Guide: Career Education Staff Development for Teacher Educators (and accompanying study packets)	1	2	3	4
e. Future Problem Solving and Career Education	1	2	3	4
f. Sociodrama in Career Education	1	2	3	4

8. Summary Comments: Please provide any comments about the conference you attended, the career education products provided by the project or the follow-up visitation by UGa staff you wish. All comments will be classified, typed and provided to the UGa staff in a manner such that anonymity is guaranteed.

APPENDIX I {CONFERENCE PHOTOGRAPHS} WAS REMOVED FOR REPRODUCIBILITY REASONS